This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

39.
446.

THE CHURCH OF ROME,

IN HER PRIMITIVE PURITY,

COMPARED WITH THE

CHURCH OF ROME,

AT THE PRESENT DAY:

BEING A CANDID EXAMINATION OF

HER CLAIMS TO UNIVERSAL DOMINION;

ADDRESSED, IN THE SPIRIT OF CHRISTIAN KINDNESS, TO THE

ROMAN HIERARCHY.

BY

JOHN HENRY HOPKINS, D.D.

BISHOP OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

IN THE DIOCESE OF VERMONT, U.S.

FIRST LONDON EDITION,

REVISED AND CORRECTED BY THE AUTHOR,

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY THE

REV. HENRY MELVILL, B.D.

Cur profers in medium, quod Petrus et Paulus edere noluerunt? Usque ad hunc diem sine ista doctrina mundus Christianus fuit. Illam senex tenebo fidem, in qua puer natus sum.—*Hieron. ad Pam. et Ocean.* Op. Om., tom. 2. p. 131.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR J. G. & F. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD,

AND WATERLOO PLACE, PALL MALL.

1839.

446.

LONDON :
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

TO THE CAUSE

OF

CATHOLIC UNITY,

AS IT EXISTED IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH,

AND AS IT STILL EXISTS

IN THE

HEARTS AND HOPES OF CHRISTIANS,

THIS VOLUME,

AN HUMBLE OFFERING

TO THE GOD OF TRUTH AND PEACE,

IS DEDICATED BY

THE AUTHOR.

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

ENGLISH EDITION.

BARROW'S Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy was not published, as is well known, during the life of the author, but was delivered by him on his death-bed to archbishop Tillotson, with a special permission that it might be given to the world. In a notice to the reader, prefixed by Tillotson to this celebrated work, we have the following strong but deserved encomium: "It is not only a just, but an admirable discourse upon this subject, which many others have handled before, but he hath exhausted it, insomuch, that no argument of moment, nay, hardly any consideration properly belonging to it, hath escaped his large and comprehensive mind. He hath said enough to silence the controversy for ever, and to deter all wise men, of both sides, from meddling any farther with it."

It will not be disputed, by any who have well acquainted themselves with Barrow's Treatise, that it fully merits the archbishop's panegyric. It is a noble work, exhibiting throughout the massive erudition and the argumenta-

tive power, which have secured for its author a lasting and lofty place in English theology. There is no point of view under which the question can be surveyed which has not engaged the writer's attention, and no process, whether of reasoning or research, to which he has not had recourse in this masterly performance. The fathers are ransacked, testimonies are examined, objections anticipated, dishonesties exposed, proofs multiplied, till the reader is almost wearied beneath accumulated truth. The style may indeed be thought cumbrous, though, after all, it is the weight of matter, rather than of words, which gives to Barrow's writings so elaborate a character. In his Treatise, however, of the Pope's Supremacy, he occasionally relieves the somewhat ponderous sentences by touches of raillery and sarcasm—as when he describes a case of schism in China as referred to "the gentleman in Italy," or speaks of this "pretended successor to the fisherman" as "really skilled to angle in troubled waters."

Whilst, however, there can be but one opinion as to the surpassing merits of Barrow's Treatise, we see no reason for assenting to the archbishop's decision, that enough has been said "to deter all wise men, of both sides, from meddling any farther with" the subject. A work, even so laboured and comprehensive as that of the accomplished Lucasian professor, is not necessarily adapted for all times and for all states of the controversy. It is not enough that a work be admirable—it must be of a form and texture to attract and detain readers; otherwise, though it may be as an armoury, from which professed combatants take weapons, it will remain, virtu-

ally, inaccessible to numbers who may, nevertheless, both need and wish information. And assuredly it is no disparagement to the book, though it may be to the age, to assert, that Barrow's Treatise has no likelihood, at present, of obtaining a wide circulation. The diligent student of the controversy with Rome is familiar with its pages, and appreciates their worth; but, though the times are such, that even the unlettered have need to know something of this controversy, we must throw truth into more portable shape, if we hope to gain for it any general attention.

On this principle, the writer of this notice felt the importance of the republication of the following work, so soon as he had been allowed to give it a perusal. In forming such an opinion, he was but following many who were far more competent to judge than himself, and whose ascertained sentiments determined the right reverend author to submit his book to the English public.

But it must not be thought that the ponderousness of Barrow's work has alone suggested the propriety of publishing another, which professes, in a measure, to occupy the same ground. This would imply, that the work of the Bishop of Vermont is but an abridgment of that of Dr. Barrow; and nothing could be farther from a just definition. It is indeed a less comprehensive and a less excursive treatise; but it is the work of an independent witness, who has followed no leader in seeking truth, and who would not be content to receive it second-hand. The title of the book sufficiently explains its object; and to

that object the writer has strictly confined himself. There can be imagined nothing fairer than the course of his argument. You are present at a sort of judicial inquiry; you sit in a court of law, with the Church of Rome upon trial; witnesses are successively called, but they are all such as that Church claims for her advocates; their testimony is sifted, as by a process of cross-examination; and we honestly think, that not one leaves the box without furnishing ground for a verdict, that the Church of Rome at the present day, has grievously departed from the Church of Rome in her primitive purity.

It must be evident at a glance, that, with such an object before him, the right reverend author was required to master a vast collection of ancient writings. But he has not flinched from the task. With singular industry he has gathered from the authorities sanctioned by the Roman canon law, whatever seemed strongest, whether for or against the pretensions of the Roman Church; and with as singular skill he has so arranged his evidence, and established its bearing, that one hardly knows how its force can be evaded. At the same time, by an unusual felicity, his work may be called popular. It is quite adapted to the general reader, though it may be only fully appreciated by the laborious divine. The temper, moreover, which pervades the whole is beautiful: there is not a harsh or acrimonious expression; controversy never looked more amiable; the writer might almost be said to wound without giving pain; and for once, at least, we have a defence of the doctrines of Christianity, without even the appearance of violence to its spirit.

It should be added, that the candour displayed in the following treatise is very observable. The Bishop of Vermont neither omits nor slurs over what would seem to favour the present claims of Rome, but states it without reserve, and examines it with as much of fairness as of acuteness. This gives a special value to the book, inasmuch as the general reader may hence satisfy himself that he is not obtaining a mere partial and one-sided view of the controversy. In regard, for example, to Jerome—so great an authority with the Romanists—it is common enough to quote his epistle to Evagrius, but to take no notice of that to Pope Damasus. Barrow himself makes repeated use of the former, but does not allude, except very remotely, to the latter. And, of course, if the Protestant quote against the Romanist the epistle to Evagrius, the Romanist will be likely to quote against the Protestant the epistle to Damasus. Our author has provided for this by a candid and careful examination of Jerome's expressions. We are not, indeed, sure that we might not safely apply to the epistle to Damasus what Barrow has said, that "we are not accountable for every hyperbolical flash or flourish occurring in the Fathers"—a saying which he vindicates by the authority of Bellarmine himself, who declares of these holy men, that they sometimes "per excessum loqui." Still, it is impossible not to admire the satisfactory manner in which the Bishop of Vermont has interpreted the exaggerated phrases.

From the reasons thus briefly indicated, it is hoped and augured that this work will obtain extensive circulation, and help to the settling men's minds as to what is

really the testimony of the Fathers on one of the chief points in controversy between the Reformed Church and the Roman. For this testimony is not to be thrown aside, as some in the present day would rashly recommend. The Church of England, in freeing herself from the corruptions of Rome, did not give up her adherence to Catholic tradition, and so set every man loose to interpret Scripture for himself. The canon of 1571, enjoining that preachers should teach nothing but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and what the Catholic fathers and ancient bishops have gathered out of that very doctrine—"nisi quod consentaneum sit doctrinæ Veteris aut Novi Testamenti, quodque ex illâ ipsâ doctrinâ Catholici patres et veteres episcopi collegerint"—sufficiently defines the mind of the Church; sufficiently shows that she never understood, by the right of private judgment, the neglect of Catholic consent and the contempt of Christian antiquity. We believe that the following often-quoted words of Vincentius Lirinensis accurately express the sentiments of our Church as to methods by which heresy should be opposed: "Diximus in superioribus hanc fuisse semper, et esse hodie, Catholicorum consuetudinem, ut fidem veram duobus his modis adprobent; primùm divini canonis authoritate, deinde Ecclesiæ Catholicæ traditione." "We have already said that it has always been, and still is, the custom of Catholics, to prove their faith in these two ways: first, by the authority of the divine canon; then by the tradition of the Catholic Church." It is this, the adherence to Catholic tradition as well as to Scripture, which fits the Anglican Church to enter the lists with Romanism. Dissent will never

make any head against popery, even if it should weary of it as a political ally; for in ecclesiastical contests there must be an appeal to antiquity, to the practices and principles of the primitive Church; and this is an appeal in which Romanism with all its abuses, must carry it over Sectarianism with all its reforms.

And if the publication of the following work should be instrumental in drawing attention to the controversy with Rome, and to the mode and spirit in which it should be conducted, it will effect an end of the very first moment. There is no disguising that the time has arrived at which the Protestant is called to put on his armour. Popery, which never breaks silence till armed with more than words, speaks now without reserve; and the establishment in these kingdoms of the Pope's supremacy, of that usurpation against which a righteous ancestry rose indignantly up, is unflinchingly declared to be aimed at, and confidently predicted to be near. And shall there be indifference? The struggle is for what we most love as men, and value as Christians. It is no party strife, no contest for political ascendency. It is a struggle between light and darkness; a conflict for the rights of conscience, for the purity of the Gospel, for the privileges of Christianity, for the hopes of immortality. We could expect nothing from the re-established ascendency of Popery but the re-established reign of oppression and terror. We accuse not the individual Papist of hating the individual Protestant; but we accuse Popery, as a system, of being necessarily intolerant and persecuting. It cannot rid itself of this: it is grained into its constitution: it would

cease to be Popery in becoming tolerant and forgiving. There is not attention enough paid to this. Men talk as if Popery might be reformed, softened, modified; they talk of an impossibility. Ever since the council of Trent, the falsehoods of Popery have been bound up with its existence, and consecrated by anathemas on all who disbelieve; so that, by its own solemn act, Popery brought itself into such a condition, that it cannot be reformed except through being destroyed.

Let us not be misunderstood. We do not mean that there could never be a reformed, a pure Church of Rome; though we confess that the acts of the Council of Trent did so much to close up the avenues to an escape from corruption, that it is hard to see where reform could begin except in abolition. Yet even these acts could not touch the truth of the foundation of the Church, or the Apostolicity of her orders: and whilst these remain, it were too much to pronounce a case past recovery. But we do not use Popery and the Church of Rome as synonymous or convertible terms—no more than we use Protestantism and the Church of Rome as opposite or antagonist terms. The terms ought to be distinguished, but have been commonly confounded; and the Romanist, in consequence, has been taught to believe that we seek the destruction of his Church, whereas we seek only the destruction of its abuses, and its restoration to its primitive state. There is much held by the Church of Rome against which we make no protest; and as this is not counter to Protestantism, we do not include it in Popery. But we take Popery and Protestantism as antagonist

terms, understanding by the former whatsoever of error is denounced by the latter. And we say of Popery thus defined, that, having been enacted, promulgated, and established, by the Council of Trent, it can only be got rid of by a bold slash of the knife—like a foul excrescence, which it is idle to attempt to reduce and disperse, and which, whilst suffered to remain, drains out all the strength of the body, and makes it little better than a carcase.

And we will not, we dare not, attribute to the spirit of a benighted age results which we can distinctly trace to the principles of a benighted system. We will not, we dare not, think that Popery offered its hecatombs of martyrs simply because the times were barbarous, and that, whatever its power, it would never attempt the like in days of greater knowledge and liberality. It did but act out its fundamental tenets: those tenets it has never abjured, and, whilst it holds itself infallible, never can. We would not, then, be deaf to the voice of the champions of the Reformation. We would not turn our eyes from that candle which was lighted in England, when bold worthies died at the stake, and which, whilst it sheds over us a rich illumination, reminds us of the fires at which it was kindled. Not unwarned, shall we again place our necks in that yoke, which "neither we, nor our fathers, were able to bear," if, through forgetfulness of our principles and contempt of our privileges, we provoke God to permit the Papacy to regain its lost power. Not unwarned: history warns us, experience warns us. In the records of by-gone days, and in the occurrences of present, we have

evidence, which should not only startle the living, but might almost raise the dead, that, if we would have freedom of inquiry, liberty of conscience, unadulterated truth; if we would worship God, "every man under his vine and fig-tree, none making him afraid;" we must withstand Popery, as we would the invader whose ominous flag might float over our seas, and act on the persuasion, that it were to surrender the Magna Charta of the land, to swerve from the religious system bequeathed us by men who engrossed it on the scaffold and sealed it at the stake.

But good things may be hoped. The Church sees the peril, and is preparing herself to meet it. There is a moral force in the Protestantism of England which has only to be roused, and, under God, it will prove irresistible. The world shall know that the children of those who achieved the Reformation, the mightiest deliverance ever wrought for the human understanding and conscience, are not to be again thralled and entangled. To announce the determination, will almost be to effect the result, that the Papal ascendency shall never be revived.

It ought to be added, in recommendation of the following work, that, soon after it had appeared in America, an answer was put forth by a Bishop of the Church of Rome —a man every way qualified, either to maintain a good cause, or give speciousness to a bad. The book was characterized throughout by courtesy and ability, but left the arguments and authorities of the work which it professed to answer, just where it found them. There is no

reason to suppose that it proved satisfactory to the Roman Catholics themselves; for it could neither be said to weaken bishop Hopkins' position, nor to give strength to the opposite. The Bishop of Vermont, therefore, remains in triumphant possession of the ground; and we anticipate for him no other result, if the Roman Catholics of Europe, like those of America, shall attempt to find shelter for their present system beneath the wing of the ancient Fathers.

The Bishop of Vermont would appear to have been one of the first in America to act vigorously on a sense of the importance of withstanding Popery. And he has not confined himself to the composing such a work as the following. He has laboured at the forming an Episcopal Institute for his Diocese, certain students in which are to be specially trained to the Papal controversy—and there is need of special training; though we have been too much in the habit of imagining, that Popery might be refuted by declaring it absurd. An endeavour to oppose a barrier to the advancings of Popery in the United States, should be hailed in England with gratitude and joy. The barrier is required. America has shut her eyes to the stealthy progress of Romanism; and now it is not merely in the humorous sayings of Judge Haliburton, but in the forebodings of the most thoughtful ecclesiastics, that we are warned of a danger that Popery may become dominant in the New World. We have a great stake in this—Popery cannot triumph on the other side of the Atlantic, and not, in consequence, be strengthened on our own.

The writer of this notice will only add, that he feels it a great honour to be concerned in introducing to the English Church a work for which he anticipates no common approval. There are other productions of the right reverend author for which this may possibly act as pioneer. Such works come with peculiar grace from the Episcopal Church in America: they are the offerings of the daughter to the mother, and prove her not unworthy her parentage: they are defences of the apostolical doctrine, which requite us for the conveyed blessing of the apostolical succession.

HENRY MELVILL.

Camberwell,
March 20, 1839.

PREFACE

TO THE

AMERICAN EDITION.

THE author of the ensuing work, in undertaking a formal discussion of Roman Catholic claims, has desired to confine himself rigidly to those authorities and to that kind of argument, which he thought best calculated for the candid consideration of his Roman brethren, and most becoming in every man, who seeks to contend for the principles of Christian truth, without forfeiting the blessings of a Christian spirit. It will be immediately obvious, to those who are at all familiar with the controversy, that he has not followed any beaten track; nor taken his model from any of the justly celebrated writers who have gone before him. With those writers, he institutes no comparison, he holds no competition. A sincere admirer of their learning and their genius, he would not, if he could, detract one word from the well-earned praise accorded to them. But still it seemed to him, that there

was abundant room for a more *simple*, and, possibly, more *effective* method of exhibiting the evidence of antiquity, upon the points in question. The track which his own mind had pursued, in examining the subject, appeared to him the most satisfactory; and in presenting the result to the lovers of primitive Christianity, he trusts they will not have reason to think that he has laboured in vain.

For the plan and special motives of the work, the author refers to the opening chapters of the book itself. It was not his design to discuss, at present, any topics except those which belong to the pope's supremacy, and the dominion claimed over the whole Christian world by the Church of Rome. The other points of the controversy, however, have been equally the subjects of his study, for many years; and the materials are collected for a similar discussion of them all, should it please Providence to favour the undertaking.

Burlington, Vt. July 1*st*, 1837.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE.

THE author's motives for the work—qualifications—plan. Why addressed to the Roman Hierarchy. The principle pursued is that which the canon law allows, and the appeal is made, in every instance, to their own acknowledged authorities. From these it will be demonstrated, that the system of the present Church of Rome could not have been the system of that Church in the primitive day 1

CHAPTER II.

The canon law set forth, recognizing the Scriptures as the fountain of truth; next to them, general councils, and then the writings of the fathers. Eighteen of the fathers specified by name in the canon law. Others specified by character, as approved by Jerome. Jerome's account of them extracted accordingly. The other works designed to be quoted for the present doctrine of the Church of Rome 11

CHAPTER III.

The present doctrine of the Church of Rome, concerning the definition of the Holy Catholic Church and the pope's supremacy, set forth at large in the words of the Doway Catechism and the canon law 17

CHAPTER IV.

Examination of the Scripture texts, appealed to in support of the pope's supremacy, as given in the Doway version. The Latin Vulgate. The modern versions. The other evidence of Scripture. The apostolic council. Testimony of St. Paul. He, and not Peter, designated in Scripture as the founder of the Church of Rome.... 22

CHAPTER V.

Testimony of the apostolical canons, inconsistent with the doctrine of the pope's supremacy 39

CHAPTER VI.

PAGE.

Testimony of the apostolical constitutions, irreconcilable with the doctrine of the pope's supremacy..... 43

CHAPTER VII.

The decretal epistles strongly in favour of the pope's supremacy, but shown to be a forgery. Candid acknowledgment of the Roman critics. A document forged in support of any claim becomes evidence against it 49

CHAPTER VIII.

Testimony of Clement of Rome inconsistent with papal supremacy.. 53

CHAPTER IX.

Testimony of Irenæus set forth at large, and shown to be adverse to the doctrine of papal supremacy. The narrative of Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, and Anicetus, bishop of Rome, totally irreconcilable with the claims of the papacy 58

CHAPTER X.

Probable origin of the doctrine of supremacy. Rome was the mistress-city of the world, and the Church established there must needs have had a superiority of influence, derived from the secular advantages of its location. Various reasons concurring to favour the establishment of this secular dominion. Not necessary to attribute the doctrine of papal supremacy to evil motives in its origin. It was probably intended for the peace and unity of Christendom; but it gave no warrant for the change by which it became a *spiritual yoke*, invested with the attributes of a divine right, and entitled to exact an universal homage at the peril of salvation 72

CHAPTER XI.

Testimony of Tertullian adverse to the papal supremacy 81

CHAPTER XII.

Testimony of Clement of Alexandria, though negative and indirect, inconsistent with papal supremacy..... 95

CHAPTER XIII.

Testimony of Origen set forth very fully. Totally irreconcilable with the papal supremacy. His character impeached of heresy. Defended by the learned Huet, and by St. Jerome..... 101

CHAPTER XIV.

Testimony of Cyprian. Some passages look favourable to the papal claim; but when compared with others, it is plain that Rome was not then invested with any supremacy. The controversy between Stephen the pope and Cyprian seems conclusive on that point. Testimony of Firmilian. Testimony of the bishops of Africa. The whole of this is inconsistent with the canon law..... 114

CHAPTER XV.

PAGE.

Testimony of Lactantius, though negative, is unfavourable to the Roman doctrine. Testimony of Eusebius at large. His commentary on the Psalms affords a passage which gives St. Paul the first place among the apostles. In his Evangelic Demonstration there is testimony of the same character. But in his Ecclesiastical history there is abundant evidence circumstantially disproving the papal claims. Testimony of the emperor Constantine. Canon of the council of Arles 130

CHAPTER XVI.

The doctrine of the canon law on general councils set forth at large. Four chief points in this doctrine which are contradicted by the testimony of the first general councils, and the fathers..... 163

CHAPTER XVII.

The person who summoned the council of Nice, according to the canon law, should have been the bishop of Rome; but, in point of fact, it was the emperor Constantine. The emperor's oration cited on this topic, with the answer of Eustathius, bishop of Antioch. Both strong against the pope's supremacy. The admission of the canonist Gibert, that not only the Nicene council, but many other general councils were convened by the emperors. The second requisite to the holding a general council, according to the canon law, is that the pope should preside in it. But he did not preside in the council of Nice, nor in many other of the general councils. The subscriptions to the Nicene council as stated by Gelasius, compared with the more ancient copy..... 172

CHAPTER XVIII.

The canons of the council of Nice which bear upon the point of Roman supremacy, altogether inconsistent with the doctrine. No infallibility claimed for the decrees of the council. Many of its canons not observed by the Church of Rome at this day 191

CHAPTER XIX.

Testimony of Athanasius irreconcilable with the doctrine of the infallibility of general councils 204

CHAPTER XX.

Testimony of Athanasius against the doctrine of papal supremacy .. 210

CHAPTER XXI.

Some other matters in the writings of Athanasius. Frauds committed under his name in favour of papal supremacy..... 216

CHAPTER XXII.

The testimony of Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, opposed to the doctrine of supremacy, and the present definition of the holy catholic Church, by necessary inference. Fraud on Cyril acknowledged by Toutteé 224

CHAPTER XXIII.

PAGE.
The testimony of Hilary of Poictiers irreconcilable with the doctrine of supremacy, and with the infallibility attributed to general councils 240

CHAPTER XXIV.

The testimony of Basil the Great. The liturgy attributed to him. His language concerning the council of Nice. The whole together is decidedly hostile to the doctrines of the canon law upon the points in question..... 253

CHAPTER XXV.

The testimony of Gregory Nazianzen. The equality of the apostles. The mother Church of Nazianzen, and of Nicopolis. The catholic Church. Its distracted condition owing to there being no chief ruler in Israel. His opinion against councils. The whole strongly opposed to Roman supremacy and infallibility..... 267

CHAPTER XXVI.

The testimony of Ambrose, bishop of Milan. Faith is the foundation of the Church. All believers are foundations of the Church. What is said to Peter is said to all. The Church of Rome charged with error. The council of Aquileia. The whole irreconcilable with the doctrine of the canon law..... 277

CHAPTER XXVII.

The testimony of Jerome. His epistle to pope Damasus. His epistle to Evagrius. The Church built on all the apostles. The rock is Christ. Bishops and presbyters originally equal. Rome is Babylon. The traditions and customs of Rome not more to be obeyed than those of other provinces. Jerome's enumeration of Origen's errors. The whole compared together, and shown to be hostile to Roman supremacy..... 290

CHAPTER XXVIII.

The testimony of Augustin. His explanation of "*Thou art Peter*," &c. directly opposed to the Roman doctrine. Power of the keys explained in like manner. St. Peter represented the Church, and St. John also. What was committed to Peter was committed to all the apostles. Augustin describes the catholic Church without any allusion to the papacy. The customs of Rome not binding. List of eighty-eight heresies. Augustin, on the whole, irreconcilable with the Roman doctrine..... 311

CHAPTER XXIX.

The testimony of Chrysostom. He interprets the proof-texts of the Doway catechism in a manner which cannot consist with the Roman claim..... 324

CHAPTER XXX.

The testimony of Isidore of Pelusium. Peter's confession was the foundation of the Church. The testimony of Prosper of Aquitain

PAGE.

concerning the catholic Church. The testimony of Vincent of Lirens. His famous standard for trying heresy altogether decisive against the present doctrine of the Church of Rome 329

CHAPTER XXXI.

Recapitulation of the witnesses. Their writings confessed to be still interpolated and impure. Yet even as they stand, the evidence is conclusive 335

CHAPTER XXXII.

The rise of the doctrine of supremacy, from the secular preponderance of ancient Rome. The imperial laws aided in establishing it. Also the councils. The change which took place acknowledged and deplored by the candid Roman catholics. Extracts in proof from Fleury 339

CHAPTER XXXIII.

The creed of pope Pius IV. quoted from Mr. Butler. Admitted to be the universally received summary of the present system. Statement of the various opinions professed concerning the extent of the papal powers among Roman catholics themselves. The Transalpine doctrine. The Cisalpine doctrine. The canon of the council of Florence 349

CHAPTER XXXIV.

These doctrines irreconcilable. No definition agreed on. The declaration of the French clergy in 1682. Disapprobation of the pope. The difficulty passed over by his successor. The oath established for the British Roman catholics in 1791. The five universities consulted by Mr. Pitt. The Cisalpine doctrine professed without any authority, and in the face of the declared system and practice of Rome for centuries. Cisalpine divines admit the facts. Their argument examined and shown to be inconclusive. The Transalpine doctrine which accords the right of dethroning heretical sovereigns, &c. to the pope, is the only *authoritative* doctrine of the present day 356

CHAPTER XXXV.

The change of primitive practice in the mode of electing the pope—ceremonies of his installation—adoration—placing him on the altar—triple crown, &c. 373

CHAPTER XXXVI.

Points of agreement. Reformed Christians are Catholics in all that is primitive, but Protestants in all that has been changed. Questions of practical importance. 1. Why the unity of the holy catholic Church should be confined to the communion of the Church of Rome, instead of being, as at first, co-extensive with the creed of the Church universal. 2. Why a vow of true obedience to the pope should be added to the creed, and made a part of faith, neces-

PAGE.

sary to salvation. 3. Why the same creed obliges the professor to say that he holds all apostolic traditions and observances of the holy catholic Church, when so many of these traditions and observances are done away. 4. Why the same creed exacts the promise to understand the Scriptures no otherwise than as the fathers unanimously interpret them, when their interpretations are so directly opposed to the present system. 5. Why all the canons of the councils are professed to be holden, when so many of them are obsolete; and especially, why the anathemas of the council of Trent should be considered binding on the conscience of every individual. Remarks on the curses which the Roman catholic is thus compelled to denounce on all out of his own pale. Lastly, Why the phantom of infallibility should be retained when the professed doctrines of the Church of Rome have confessedly undergone such a change, and when, to this day, there are several inconsistent theories concerning the papacy afloat, without any acknowledged mode of deciding between them..... 377

CONCLUDING CHAPTER.

Attempts made in the seventeenth century to unite the reformed Churches with the Gallican Church of Rome. Circumstances existing at present more favourable to such an enterprise. The Church of Rome chiefly concerned to improve the opportunity. A disposition to return to primitive principles, a discussion of those principles for the sake of truth and peace, with the encouraging aid of those governments which have an established religion, would probably, under God, soon settle every difficulty. The peril of the distracted state of Christendom. The responsibility of the present generation. The author's prayer for peace..... 389

THE

CHURCH OF ROME

IN HER

PRIMITIVE PURITY,

&c.

CHAPTER I.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

AN address to an ecclesiastical body so numerous, so powerful, so august, as the Hierarchy of the Church of Rome, from an individual of humble name and small reputation, may well seem, if not to others, at least to you, in need of an apology. Let me state, therefore, in all simplicity, the motives which have incited me to the present undertaking.

I belong to the communion of the Protestant Episcopal Church, descended from the Church of England, which you call heretical and schismatic. Unworthy, as I freely acknowledge myself, of such a distinction, it has pleased Divine Providence to place me in the office of bishop in that Church, the least among my brethren. On the ground then, in the first place, of official duty, I ask the privilege of reasoning with you on the authority by which you deny us a place in the Catholic Church, and condemn us as having neither part nor lot in the heritage of the faithful.

But besides this official right, I confess,—even at the hazard of being accused of egotism,—that I have a feeling of more than usual depth and earnestness upon the subject of your claims. Although a constant inhabitant of the United States for almost forty years, yet I cannot forget that my first breath was drawn in that ill-fated island, which has felt the evils of religious discord so bitterly, and so long. True, the associations of my childhood have all been broken, and their faded relics are like the dim memory of a dream. But the love of my native land has never left me; nor have I ever ceased to cherish a strong personal interest in all that concerns her prosperity and peace. May I not be allowed, therefore, to say that I possess a sort of birthright in the discussion of the Roman Catholic controversy, which should obtain for me a patient and indulgent hearing?

There is a third ground, however, on which I should defend my work, derived from the fact, that the controversy between our respective Churches deserves to be considered the most exciting and important religious topic of the age. In comparison with this, all other controversies sink into insignificance. Your assertion that the Church of Rome is the mother and mistress of all the Churches, and that out of her pale there is no salvation—your numbers, which are stated to exceed all the other branches of the Christian Church together, by a proportion of nearly two to one—your vast and well-disciplined influence over the education of the civilized world—your hosts of devoted laity, men and women, whose property, and time, and talents, are consecrated to your service—the imposing magnificence of your ritual, so well adapted to captivate the imagination and the feelings of your votaries—your deep and various learning, so skilfully displayed in the defence of your system,—the venerable air of antiquity which invests your peculiar doctrines

with a special charm—and the aspect of unbroken unity with which you stand before the divided and jarring ranks of your opponents,—all this does assuredly confer an importance on the subject of your claims, which can hardly be too highly estimated; and which forms, of itself, a justification of every attempt to ascertain the strength of the evidence on which they are sustained.

Nor do I think it the least important part of the case, that the temper of the times in which we live calls for a peculiar effort to investigate the merits of this controversy. Your enemies, particularly in this country, are numerous, determined, and unsparing. The most unparalleled assaults of violence have been directed against you, and a community distinguished for its liberality and refinement has refused you any adequate redress[1]. The press has teemed with the darkest and most shameless accusations against your institutions, and no calumny of which you are declared to be the object seems too gross for the public ear. The gaze of unkind suspicion is every where upon you: the very kennels of history are industriously raked for evidence against you: the bitterest intolerance thinks itself justified in alarming the community by terrific statements of your alleged enormities; and the veil of your monastic seclusion and your vows of celibacy are currently represented as the contrivance of systematic guilt, and the covering of sensual abomination. It is surely, then, required, by the voice of charity and truth, that some one should examine the questions at issue between us, upon their real merits, without the artificial and fallacious colouring in which a wild and intolerant zeal has depicted them: and it is equally required by the precept which commands us to judge as we would be judged, that your motives and your charac-

[1] The allusion is to the burning of the Convent near Boston, A.D. 1834.

ter should be kindly regarded, even when your doctrines are condemned.

But you will naturally ask, what qualifications I possess for my undertaking; on what principle I design to prosecute it; and why I choose to address it to the Hierarchy, the Clergy of your Church, rather than to the people, or the public at large.

To the first question I frankly answer, that my qualifications for this or any other good work are far below those of very many amongst my brethren. But it is nearly twelve years since my attention was first directed to the merits of this controversy; and my best faculties, such as they are, have been long occupied in ascertaining the truth from every accessible source of information. Your own books have been my study—your own editions of the Fathers and the Councils. Not only your canon law, but the decretal epistles, and many of those apocryphal writings under the name of Clement and others, which the learned of your own Church condemn, have been industriously examined during this period, in order that I might be capable of a fair judgment on the real evidence of antiquity. I had read the leading works on both sides, and saw that both parties appealed to the same Bible, the same Fathers, and the same Councils, while yet the conclusions which they drew were not to be reconciled. It was obvious, therefore, that the labour of perusing these authorities *in their own connexion*, was the only perfect method of arriving at the whole truth—a labour that few men, perhaps, in our day, are willing to undergo. But for myself, I can say, that I found it not only a work of toil, but a work of the deepest interest and gratification. And the results of these studies, which I desire, in part, to offer you—however humble the claims of my work may otherwise appear—are at least the fruits of sincere and honest investigation.

Next to the qualification derived from a patient and laborious examination of your authorities, permit me to say, that my personal and local circumstances are calculated to preserve me from any bias. Whatever influence the interest of a powerful religious establishment may be supposed to exert over the minds of my British brethren, the Church in this country[1] has neither honours nor wealth to tempt our integrity in the pursuit of truth. Whatever prejudice the unhappy collisions of Europe, or the morbid fears of the United States may excite, to warp the judgment by the force of the passions, my lot has been so cast, in the mercy of Providence, as to be altogether exempt from them. On the contrary, the little intercourse which I have had with you, has been the intercourse of kindness and courtesy; and it has been my fortune to know several of your people, whose virtues would have done honour to any creed. Hence, so far as the qualifications of circumstances and feeling are concerned, I think that I am under no inducement to do you the slightest injustice: and greatly am I mistaken if you shall be able to detect, in the following pages, a single instance of asperity, of irony, of bitterness, or any other unseemly exhibition, on which a Christian disputant could look back with sorrow at his dying hour.

In reply to the second question, I have to say, that the principle on which I shall proceed will be *your own principle*, and no other. I am perfectly willing that the Church of Rome should be the standard of primitive Christianity, provided the Church of Rome be taken AT THE PRIMITIVE DAY. But if the Church of Rome *has varied from herself*, and this can be demonstrably proved by her own acknowledged authorities, then, surely, it will be admitted, that the older pattern must be the

[1] America.

apostolic pattern, and that the present Church of Rome SHOULD RETURN TO HER ORIGINAL SELF, before she accuses us of innovation. In the evidence which I shall adduce to establish this change, I shall have recourse to your own witnesses. The Scriptures in your own version, the Fathers, the Liturgies, the Councils, the Canon law, and the accredited declaration of your clergy in France, will furnish my principal vouchers: and in every instance the original shall be quoted in full, that you may judge, without the trouble of a search, whether I have given a fair translation. You will surely grant that the principle here stated is just and true; and I trust that you will find it faithfully maintained throughout these pages.

To the third question, namely, Why I choose to address you, the clergy or Hierarchy of the Church of Rome, rather than your people, or the public at large, I beg leave to offer the following reply.

The public—that is, the community in general—take small interest in religious controversies. Those amongst them whom my subject would attract are "few and far between;" and therefore I address them not. Religious controversy, I am well aware, has often been made interesting to the public, when it was strongly seasoned with gross abuse, slanderous mis-statements, personal invective, amusing or romantic narrative, wit, sarcasm, highly wrought eloquence, or other attractions which the public taste admires. But religious argument composed with sobriety, and put forth in the spirit of truth and peace, has no right to expect *popular* favour.

As to your people, I address them not, because, for the most part, they have neither the liberty nor the inclination to read what any Protestant would set before them. The laity are not qualified, in general, to understand or to relish such discussions. True, there are many honourable exceptions to this remark; but not enough to justify

writers, far more attractive than I pretend to be, in addressing them. But the laity of the Church of Rome, especially, are altogether unlikely to read any thing which their clergy would not sanction. Your rules of confession, and your strict superintendence over your flocks, confine their religious studies within an approved circle; and, therefore, controversy must reach them through you, if it reaches them at all.

I have, then, concluded to address you, on this occasion, as being, on the whole, the proper body. I do it, because I take for granted that you are bound, above all men, to examine the foundation of your system, and to be thoroughly satisfied that it is justified by the truth of God. You are the absolute guides of millions of your fellow-beings, who look up to you with the most implicit faith, the most undoubting confidence; not pretending to judge for themselves in any religious matter, but trusting all their immortal hopes to your presumed infallibility. Many there are—very many—in the Protestant ranks, who think you dishonest, profligate, hypocritical dissemblers; preaching what you do not yourselves believe, for the sake of your priestly influence over the bodies and souls of men. God forbid that I should think so! I judge you as I would desire to be judged. I have no right to question your sincerity and truth. I proceed on the presumption that you estimate aright the tremendous responsibility of your office—tremendous in all cases, but emphatically so in yours, since your power over your people, and their confidence in your guidance, are so far beyond the ordinary standard throughout the rest of Christendom. And therefore I address you in the steadfast hope, that you will look at the authorities and arguments here presented, with candid minds, as men who feel their accountability to Christ, the great Shepherd, and who know that there is but a step between them and

death. Yours is not the common case of a Church, confessing themselves to be only a portion of the Lord's kingdom, and doing their work according to their ability, without any exclusive prerogative beyond their brethren. You CLAIM THE WHOLE. You identify the Church of Rome with the Church Catholic or Universal. You call the bishop of Rome the Vicar of Christ. Out of your communion you deny that any one can be saved. Your doctrines are all placed on an equality with the Word of God, for in them all you claim the same infallibility. You hold in your hands the peace of nations. You assert your empire over the unseen world, promising to deliver the disembodied soul from purgatorial pains, and deciding the title of departed saints to the mansions of glory. O brethren ! if you have indeed a right to claim all this—if the Almighty Redeemer has indeed invested you with such powers—far be it from me to desire the invasion of your prerogatives. But if not—if these claims are not the original characteristics of the Church of Rome, but are the accumulated changes which time and opportunity brought in upon the apostolic system—look to it, I beseech you, for they are fearful assumptions if they be not warranted by the King of kings. Before Him, you and I shall meet in judgment. To Him, you must justify your claims, and I my feeble attempt to question them. May His truth, which is ONE, be found our defence in that day; for the prejudice of education, the pride of place, the ignorance which we might have overcome, or the glory of this world's dominion, will yield us no apology for error before the throne of God.

I shall only add a few words on the results expected from my present labour, lest you might suppose that I attach an importance to it, which it cannot justly claim. Let me, then, observe, that the question of results has not entered into my circle of calculations. In the mind

of the politician, the mechanist, the man of science, the man of trade, or any of the numerous classes which spend their intellectual energies on the things of time and sense, the expected result of their operations must occupy the first place, since it furnishes the only efficient motive for their exertions. But the defender of religious truth acts in obedience to the principle of duty, and leaves the result with God. The men who are, by office, the especial standard bearers in the army of Christ, are bound to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," whether their efforts are likely to be accounted the greatest or the least in the annals of human achievement. For me, therefore, it is enough to know, that the servant who had but a single talent of his Lord's money committed to his trust, was punished because he employed it not according to his Master's will. In the cause of the divine Gospel—in the service of the Church of God—in the defence of its primitive and apostolic truth and order, I hold myself bound to strive with all men—not in the spirit of bitterness, nor in the bigotry of intolerance, nor in the pride of self-opinion, but in charity and kindness and good will—according to the small measure of ability which it has pleased Heaven to bestow. And thus proceeding, the question of results gives me no concern. I may be vilified, because I condemn the coarse vituperation with which so many good men, in their mistaken zeal, have thought fit to assail you. I may bear the doom so often experienced by those, who, in times of high and strong excitement, presume to follow the sober track of justice and of candour. Or, worse than all, my humble work may possibly be like an arrow shot into the air, which strikes no mark, creates no noise, leaves no track behind it, and is discovered, after a little space, lying idly on the ground. But what have these fears to do with the course of duty? And how precious a conso-

lation is afforded to the servant of Christ, when he is able, in the language and the faith of the great apostle, to say, "It is a small thing with me that I be judged of you or of man's judgment—He that judgeth me is the Lord."

In his name, then, brethren—in the service of his truth, and as the advocate of his ecclesiastical polity, I address you. I desire no better standard of my faith and practice than your own Church displayed, in the early ages of her first love; I ask no better evidence of what she then was, than your own witnesses have set before me: and my design is to exhibit the testimony of these witnesses in its own simplicity and power, and to shew how you have changed your original system, not as some suppose, by the deliberate adoption of any principle of evil, but BY AN EXCESSIVE OVERSTRAINING OF WHAT WAS INTENDED TO BE GOOD, ON MISTAKEN VIEWS OF EXPEDIENCY.

The motives to my undertaking—its principle—its general plan—are now before you. For the result I ask no other security than the Redeemer's blessing, nor do I covet any other praise for my reward.

CHAPTER II.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

I HAVE said that the principle on which this address should proceed, is your own principle; and that I should make my appeal in every case to the authorities sanctioned by your own Canon law. Let me premise the list of those on which I rely, as witnesses admitted by yourselves to be above all exception. "Proofs," in the words of your favourite Aristotle, "are the only skill; all the rest are but appendages [1]."

From the well-known work of your famous Canonist Gibert, entitled an Exposition of the Canon law, I quote the following passages:—

"Holy Scripture is the fountain of the Canon law, with respect to faith and manners, and also with respect to the necessity, the utility, and the form of Councils [2]."

"Next to the Holy Scripture, the principal fountain of the Canon law at the present day are General Councils [3]."

"The Canon law expressly approves the writings of

[1] *αἱ γὰρ πίστεις ἔντεχνον ἐστι μόνον· τὰ δ' ἄλλα προσθήκαι.* Aristot. Rhet. Lib. 1. Cap. 1. v. 3.

[2] "Scriptura Sacra, juris est fons quoad fidem et mores, et quoad necessitatem, utilitatem, et formam Conciliorum;" (Corpus Jur. Can. Joan. Gib. Tom. 1. Pars 2. Tit. 4. Ed. Colon. A.D. 1732. p. 11.)

[3] "Post Scripturam Sacram, præcipuus hodierni juris canonici fons sunt Concilia Generalia." Ib.

several doctors: viz. 1. Those of the blessed Cyprian, martyr and bishop of Carthage: 2. those of the blessed Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria: 3. those of the blessed Gregory, bishop of Nazianzen: 4. those of the blessed Basil, bishop of Cappadocia: 5. those of the blessed John Chrysostom, bishop of Constantinople: 6. those of the blessed Hilary, bishop of Poictiers: 7. those of the blessed Augustin, bishop of Hippo: 8. those of the blessed Ambrose, bishop of Milan: 9. those of the blessed Jerome, Presbyter: 10. those of Prosper, a most religious man: 11. the epistle of the blessed Leo to Flavian, the bishop of Constantinople, whose text, even to a tittle, if any laic or illiterate person disputes, and does not receive it with reverence in all things, let him be accursed: 12. those writings of Ruffinus and of Origen, which the blessed Jerome does not reject: 13. those of Orosius, a very learned man: 14. those of the venerable Sedulius: 15. those of Vincent: 16. those of Eusebius of Cesarea, with some restriction: 17. those of the blessed Cyril, which are received by the fifth General Council: 18. those of saint Isidore[1]."

Besides these fathers whom your Canon law thus ex-

[1] "Non paucorum Scripta Doctorum Canon expressè approbat."—"Non aliorum Scripta expressè probat Canon, quàm istorum.

"1. Beati Cypriani martyris et Carthaginiensis Episcopi. 2. Beati Athanasii Alexandrini Episcopi. 3. Beati Gregorii Nazianzeni Episcopi. 4. Beati Basilii Cappadociæ Episcopi. 5. Beati Joannis Constantinopolitani Episcopi. 6. Hilarii Pictaviensis Episcopi. 7. Beati Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi. 8. Beati Ambrosii Episcopi. 9. Beati Hieronymi Presbyteri. 10. Prosperi viri religiosissimi. 11. Epistolam Beati Leonis ad Flavianum Constantinopolitanum Episcopum destinatam, cujus textum aut unum iota, si quisquam idiota disputaverit, et non eam in omnibus venerabiliter acceperit, Anathema sit. 12. Rufini et Origenis quæ beatus Hieronymus non repudiat. 13. Orosii viri eruditissimi. 14. Venerabilis viri Sedulii. 15. Vincentii. 16. Eusebii Cæsariensis cum quâdam restrictione. 17. Beati Cyrilli opera a quinto Concilio Generali recepta. 18. Sancti Isidori." Ib. Tit. 5. p. 12.

pressly names, it pronounces a general approbation of all the orthodox fathers, and of all that Jerome approves, although in some respects he may have had cause to blame them. Indeed the judgment of Jerome is cardinal with you. He is called, in your Canon law, *most blessed*, while the other fathers are called *blessed* only; and in Origen, Ruffinus, and others, his censure is taken as the index to that which should be condemned, by the plain sentence of pope Gelasius, who flourished in the fifth century. From the catalogue, therefore, which Jerome himself furnishes, I take my authority for some others of the fathers, which I shall have occasion to cite; and I mention them now, in order that the ground-work may be firmly settled before I proceed. They are as follows; viz.

Irenæus, mentioned by Jerome with great commendation. He was bishop of Lyons, and his books were published about A.D. 170[1].

Clement of Alexandria, the master of the famous catechetical school after Pantænus, whose books Jerome calls "admirable volumes, full of erudition and eloquence, taken both from the Holy Scriptures and from secular literature[2]."

Tertullian, the profound and learned presbyter of Carthage, who flourished about A.D. 200, and whose works

[1] "Irenæus Pothini Episcopi, qui Lugdunensem in Gallia regebat ecclesiam presbyter, a martyribus ejusdem loci ob quasdam ecclesiæ quæstiones legatus Romam missus, honorificas super nomine suo ad Eleutherium Episcopum perfert literas. Postea jam Pothino propè nonagenario, ob Christum martyrio coronato, in locum ejus substituitur. Scripsit quinque adversus hæreses libros," &c. Sanct. Hieron. Op. om. Ed. 1684. Tom. 1. p. 180. B.

[2] "Clemens Alexandriæ Ecclesiæ presbyter, Pantæni auditor, post ejus mortem Alexandriæ ecclesiasticam scholam tenuit, et κατηχήσεων magister fuit. Feruntur ejus insignia volumina, plenaque eruditionis et eloquentiæ, tam de Scripturis divinis, quam de secularis literaturæ instrumento. E quibus illa sunt, Στρωματεῖς, libri octo," &c. Ib. 181. B.

were the favourite study of St. Cyprian. Jerome records the fact, that Cyprian never passed a day without reading this author, and frequently called him "the master." He fell, however, towards the close of his life, into the error of Montanus, and Jerome attributes his lapse to the envy and reproaches of the Roman clergy. Hence there are some parts of his works that you receive with approbation; namely, those which were written previous to his adoption of the error of Montanus; but those which were written afterwards you reject. In quoting from this writer, I shall not forget this distinction: nevertheless, there are some things, even in his rejected pages, worthy of attention [1].

Lactantius is another ecclesiastical writer mentioned by Jerome with approbation, and celebrated, as you know, for the remarkable beauty of his style, from whom I shall draw some testimony, on the points to be discussed [2].

[1] "Tertullianus presbyter—provinciæ Africæ, civitatis Carthaginensis, patre Centurione proconsulari. Hic acris et vehementis ingenii,—multa scripsit volumina, quæ quia nota sunt pluribus, prætermittimus. Vidi ego quendam Paulum Concordiæ, quod oppidum Italiæ est, senem, qui se beati Cypriani jam grandis ætatis notarium, cum ipse admodum esset adolescens, Romæ vidisse diceret, referreque sibi solitum, nunquam Cyprianum absque Tertulliani lectione unam diem prætermisisse, ac sibi crebro dicere: Da magistrum: Tertullianum videlicet significans. Hic cum usque ad mediam ætatem presbyter ecclesiæ permansisset, invidia postea et contumeliis clericorum Romanæ ecclesiæ, ad Montani dogma delapsus, in multis libris novæ prophetiæ meminit, specialiter autem adversum ecclesiam texuit volumina De Pudicitia, De Persecutione, De Jejuniis, De Monogamia, De Ectasi libros sex, et septimum quem adversum Apollonium composuit. Ferturque vixisse usque ad decrepitam ætatem, et multa quæ non extant opuscula condidisse." Ib. p. 183.

[2] "Firminianus, qui et Lactantius, Arnobii discipulus,———Nicomediæ Rhetoricam docuit.———Habemus ejus Symposium, quod adolescentulus scripsit, ὁδοιπορικὸν de Aphrica ad Nicomediam, hexametris scriptum versibus, et alium librum qui inscribitur Grammaticus, et pulcherrimum de Ira Dei, et Institutionum Divinarum adversum gentes libros septem," &c. Ib. p. 189.

The editions of the Councils which I shall use, are your admirable collections by Hardouin and Mansi; and I shall quote largely from the celebrated declaration of the clergy of France, put forth by the powerful and masterly genius of your famous Bossuet, the illustrious bishop of Meaux.

There are three books more, to which I shall refer. The first is the elaborate work of your ecclesiastical historian Fleury; the second is the well-known book of Charles Butler, Esq. one of your most accomplished advocates, entitled the Book of the Roman Catholic Church; and the third is the familiar abridgement commonly called the Doway Catechism, composed originally in 1649 by the Rev. Henry Tuberville of your college at Doway, generally used by the Roman Catholics of the British empire, and lately recommended by the Right Rev. Benedict, bishop of Boston. The American stereotype edition of 1833 is the copy before me. The edition of the Holy Scriptures from which my quotations shall, for the most part, be made, is your own version, put forth by the same college at Doway, first stereotyped from the fifth Dublin edition, published in 1824, with notes and comments.

Besides the above, however, I shall consider myself bound to notice some other relics of antiquity, viz. the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, the Apostolic Canons, and the Apostolical Constitutions. I shall also comment occasionally on those unquestionable frauds, such as the Decretal epistles and others, which will unavoidably present themselves in the path which lies before me; and in all such cases I shall cite the opinion of your most distinguished scholars, as a justification of my own. That the plan of my work will call for many repetitions, will be pardoned, I trust, from the nature of my undertaking. But I can, at least, promise that nothing shall be taken

at second hand, or presented out of its true connexion. And if I cannot show from these, your own authorities, that your Church has changed her original polity, and that the primitive Church of Rome would have accorded far more closely with ourselves, I will forthwith conform to your standard, and publicly confess my error.

CHAPTER III.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

THE change of your primitive doctrine, to the examination of which this volume is chiefly devoted, is in your definition of "The Holy Catholic Church," which you make inseparably dependent upon the Church of Rome; although it anciently signified, and still in truth signifies, the Church General, or Universal, without regard to any particular diocese or city.

Your claims on this head consist in the allegation, that our great Redeemer constituted St. Peter the prince of the Apostles, and gave him a right of government and authority over the rest, which right he bequeathed to his successor, the bishop or pope of Rome, who thereby became the VICAR OF CHRIST, *and the head of the whole Christian Church throughout the world*[1].

This position you undertake to establish, first, from the twenty-first chapter of St. John's Gospel, where Christ, as you state in your Doway catechism (p. 20), "gave St. Peter absolute power to feed and govern his whole flock, saying, Feed my lambs, feed my sheep: therefore the rest of the apostles were his sheep, and he their head or pastor."

[1] Thus the Doway Catechism, p. 20, declares that "The Church is the Congregation of all the faithful under Jesus Christ, their invisible head, and his vicar upon earth, the Pope."

"Secondly," according to this catechism, "out of St. Matthew (xvi. 18) when Christ saith, Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church. Therefore the rest of the apostles were built on Him."

Thirdly, "Because," as saith the same catechism (p. 25), "since the translation of St. Peter's chair from Antioch to Rome, the particular Roman Church has been head of all the Churches, and to her the primacy has been affixed."

Hence, in defining the *essential parts* of the Church (p. 20), the same catechism declares that the Church consists of "a Pope, or supreme head, bishops, pastors, and laity;" and in full consistency with this, we read in the next page, that "he who is not in due connexion and subordination to the Pope and General Councils, must needs be dead, and cannot be accounted a member of the Church, since FROM *the Pope and General Councils, under Christ, we have our spiritual life and motion, as Christians.*"

I attach importance to this catechism, not because of its intrinsic dignity, but because it is the text book from which, throughout Great Britain and the United States, you instruct your flocks. Besides which, it gives the latest statement of your doctrine, and therefore, it is to be presumed, the most moderate and least offensive in your own opinion. Let me next proceed, however, to make some stronger extracts from your Canon law.

"The Pope," says your Canon, "by the Lord's appointment, is the successor of the blessed Apostle Peter, and holds the place of the Redeemer himself upon the earth[1]."

[1] "Beati Petri Apostoli, disponente Domino, Papa est successor, et ipsius Redemptoris locum in terris tenet." Corp. Jur. Can. Joan. Gib. tom. ii. p. 6.

"The Roman Church, by the appointment of our Lord, is the mother and mistress of all the faithful [1]."

"The Roman Pontiff bears the authority not of a mere man, but of the true God upon the earth [2]."

"The Pope holds the place of God in the earth, that he may confer ecclesiastical benefices without diminution [3]."

"Christ, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, gave to the Roman Pontiff, in the person of Peter, the plenitude of power [4]."

"To the Holy Roman Church, as to the mother and head, all the greater causes of the Church may recur, and receive their decision according to her sentence; nor ought any thing to be decreed in these without the Roman Pontiff [5]."

"The greater causes of the Church, especially those which concern the articles of faith, are to be referred to the seat of Peter [6]."

"The translation, the deposition or resignation of a bishop, is reserved to the Roman Pontiff alone, not so much by any canonical constitution, as by the divine institution [7]."

[1] "Romana Ecclesia, disponente Domino, cunctorum fidelium Mater est et Magistra." Ib. p. 8.

[2] "Romanus Pontifex non puri hominis, sed veri Dei vicem gerit in terris." Ib. p. 9.

[3] "Papa locum Dei tenet in terris, ut Ecclesiastica Beneficia sine diminutione conferat." Ib.

[4] "Plenitudinem potestatis Christus Rex regum et Dominus dominantium Romano Pontifici in persona Petri concessit." Ib. p. 10.

[5] "Ad sanctam Romanam Ecclesiam, quasi ad matrem atque apicem, omnes majores Ecclesiæ causæ recurrant, et juxta ejus sententiam terminum sumant; nec extra Romanum quidquam ex his debeat decerni Pontificem." Ib. p. 12.

[6] "Majores Ecclesiæ causas, præsertim articulos fidei contingentes, ad Petri sedem referendas." Ib. p. 12.

[7] "Translatio, depositio, aut cessio Episcopi, non tam constitutione

"As the translation, the deposition, and resignation of bishops, so likewise the confirmation of the electors after the election, is reserved to the Roman Pontiff alone, by reason of the spiritual bond [1]."

"Although miracles may have been performed by any one, yet it is not lawful to venerate him as a saint, without the authority of the Roman Church [2]."

"Whenever there is any question concerning the privileges of the Apostolic chair, they are not to be judged by others. The Pope alone knows how to determine doubts concerning the privileges of the chief Apostolic seat [3]."

"To make one episcopal seat subject to another, or to place one before another, or to unite two dioceses into one, or divide one into two, are things reserved to the chief Pontiff alone [4]."

"It was becoming, since the chief Pontiff represents the person of Christ, that as during Christ's earthly ministry the Apostles stood round Him, so the assembly of the Cardinals, representing the Apostolic college, should stand before the Pope; but the rest of the bishops, scattered abroad every where, represent the Apostles sent forth to preach the Gospel [5]."

canonica, quam institutione divina, soli sunt Romano Pontifici reservata." Ib. p. 13.

[1] "Sicut Episcoporum translatio, depositio, et cessio, sic et electorum post electionem confirmatio, spiritualis ratione conjugii, soli est Romano Pontifici reservata." Ib. p. 13.

[2] "Etiamsi per aliquem miracula fierent, non liceret ipsum pro sancto, absque autoritate Ecclesiæ Romanæ, venerari." Ib.

[3] "Cùm super privilegiis sedis Apostolicæ causa vertitur; de ipsis per alios non judicatur.—Solus Papa cognoscit de dubiis privilegiorum sedis Apostolicæ summæ." Ib. p. 13.

[4] "Sunt tantùm summo Pontifici reservata: unam Episcopalem Ecclesiam subjicere alteri, et illam præficere isti: concesso sibi privilegio Primatiæ, atque duos Episcopatus unire, vel unum dividere." Id. p. 13.

[5] "Decuit, cùm summus Pontifex Christi repræsentet personam, ut

These extracts may suffice for the present, to prove the nature and effect of the prerogatives with which you invest the Church and the pontiff of Rome. His powers in reference to Councils, will be reserved for a future chapter. Let me now proceed to prove that you have changed your primitive doctrine, by showing what the Scriptures, the ancient fathers, and the first General Council, declare upon the matter. And here, brethren, I must bespeak your patient attention. The witnesses are numerous, and the examination must be thorough, if we would hope to be rewarded by the discovery of truth. When this preliminary labour is accomplished, I shall examine the two conflicting theories concerning the limits of papal power, which have excited so much serious controversy amongst yourselves; and shall show, as it seems to me, that the claims of your canon law on that point have never been relinquished, but continue to represent your doctrine fairly, to this day. A few practical considerations for your sober reflection, will then bring us to the conclusion.

quemadmodum Christo conversanti in terris assistebant Apostoli, ita etiam Cardinalium cœtus Apostolicum repræsentans, coram Papa assisteret; reliqui verò Episcopi, ubique diffusi, Apostolos repræsentant ad prædicandum per orbem missos." Ib. p. 19.

CHAPTER IV.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

ACCORDING to the principle allowed by your own canon law, which appeals to Scripture as its fountain, I shall first examine your alleged primacy of the apostle Peter, as it appears in this infallible oracle of truth.

You deduce your doctrine on the subject from the passage of St. Matthew (xvi. 18), where Peter, declaring that the Redeemer was Christ, the Son of the living God, received from our Lord the gracious answer, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona; because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall also be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."

Next, you cite the passage in St. John's Gospel (xxi. 16, &c.), where the Saviour saith to Peter, "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these? He saith to him, Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him, Feed my lambs [1]. He saith to him

[1] The word *lambs*, here, ought to be *sheep*. See your own Montanus, and the margin of your vulgate. I quote it, however, in the words of your Doway version, as I am pledged to do.

again: Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? He saith to him: Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him: Feed my lambs. He saith to him the third time: Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved, because he said to him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said to him: Lord, thou knowest all things: thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him, Feed my sheep."

Upon the first of these texts, your Doway version has this note: "The words of Christ to Peter, spoken in the vulgar language of the Jews, which our Lord made use of, were the same as if he had said in English, *Thou art a rock, and upon this rock I will build my Church.* So that, by the plain course of the words, Peter is here declared to be the rock upon which the Church was to be built, Christ himself being both the principal foundation and founder of the same."

I shall cite to you, by and by, in their proper place, many authorities from the primitive fathers, mentioned in your own canon law, to prove that they gave no such interpretation to these texts; from which the inference may be safely drawn, that the primitive Church of Rome did not hold your doctrine. But meanwhile, the importance of the subject demands a critical examination of the first text especially, in which I shall have no difficulty in showing how very far your commentary has strayed from the true laws of interpretation.

You tell us, in the note which I have quoted from your Doway version, what our Lord must have said "*in the vulgar language of the Jews.*" For what purpose is this, brethren? Do you mean that the original Gospel, which is in the Greek, is not our only sure authority? True, indeed, it is asserted by some of the ancients, that the Gospel according to St. Matthew was first written in Hebrew, and afterwards translated into Greek; but

you are perfectly aware, that if it had been so, the Hebrew copy was altogether lost; and therefore the Christian Church throughout the world possesses no other original of St. Matthew's Gospel than the Greek, in which all the rest of the New Testament Scriptures were written. You surely, then, would not lead us from this faithful record, to the imaginary words which our Lord *might have* used in Hebrew: nor can you argue the point on any other ground than the Greek text would justify, without prostrating the whole authority of the New Testament Scriptures.

But we are happy in the aid which we derive, in this point of controversy, from your own Latin Vulgate, declared, by your Council of Trent, to be authentic, so that "no one may dare or presume to reject it, under any pretext whatsoever[1]." And therefore, leaving the fanciful notion of what our Saviour might have said in Hebrew, to the actual record of what He did say, as it stands in the Greek, and in your own accredited Latin, let us examine whether your Doway commentary is tenable.

In the Greek, the words are: σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

In the Latin Vulgate: *Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam.*

Now the closest version of the Greek in English would be: Thou art a stone, and on this rock I will build my Church. But to preserve at the same time the true idea of the original, and also the play upon the name, is

[1] "Decretum de editione et usu sacrorum librorum.—Sacrosancta Synodus——statuit et declarat ut hæc ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quæ longo tot sæculorum usu in ipsa ecclesia probata est, in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, prædicationibus, et expositionibus, pro authentica habeatur; et ut nemo illam rejicere quovis prætextu audeat vel præsumat." Concil. Hard. tom. x. p. 23.

not possible in any modern language. To make the Greek and the Latin accord with your commentary, you know perfectly well, brethren, that an alteration of the phraseology would be necessary. Thus, in the Greek, our Lord does not say: ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῷ Πέτρῳ, but ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ, recurring to the radical word, which is of a different gender. Πέτρα is the root, signifying a rock, which rock was Christ. Πετραῖος is the adjective, signifying rocky or stony. And Πέτρος, the name given to Peter, signifies a stone, and sometimes a rock, in a diminutive sense, being derived from πέτρα. Therefore, as I shall show you in due time, the fathers held that Peter received his name from the rock, just as the believer is called Christian, from Christ. In like manner, your Latin Vulgate stands opposed to your Doway commentary, and would require an alteration in its language, before it could be made to correspond with your doctrine. Instead of, *Tu es Petrus*, it would be necessary to write it, *Tu es Petra, et super hanc Petram*, &c. So that in both these authoritative records, *Peter* is one word of the masculine gender, and *the rock* is a different word, of the feminine gender; and yet you ask us to believe that they are both the same.

I have before me several versions of this passage, which it may be not altogether useless to cite, before we leave it. The turn of thought in the original is instructive and beautiful, but it does not admit of a faithful rendering in many languages; for Peter became a proper name, which could only show its relation to the rock in those languages where the term rock was derived from the Grecian fountain. Thus, in the German version of the passage, we read: *Du bist Petrus, und auf diesen Felsen will ich bauen meine Gemeine.* Here, as in the English, the turn of the original is altogether lost, for

the structure of the German did not allow of its being translated.

In the French, on the contrary, the correspondence of the name is made so perfect, that equal injury, in another respect, is done to the original meaning. *Tu es Pierre, et sur cette pierre je batirai mon Eglise.* Literally, Thou art Peter, and on this *stone* I will build my Church. In this version the Church is truly built on Peter, but the rock is omitted altogether.

In the Italian and the Spanish, the versions are more true to the original. Thus, in the Italian: *Tu sei Pietro, e sopra questa pietra io edifichero la mia chiesa.* And in the Spanish: *Tu eres Pedro, y sobre esta piedra edificaré mi Iglesia.*

The fidelity of the Latin Vulgate is well retained in both these versions; but out of the whole seven languages, brethren, you see that there is not one which justifies your Doway commentary. The French approaches the nearest to it; but there, as I have shown you, instead of changing Peter into the rock, you have changed the rock into a stone, in order to make it agree with Peter.

Plainly, then, as it seems to me, by no fair process of interpretation, can this celebrated text be made to support the supremacy of Peter. The apostle was blest with the privilege of being a stone, yea, a foundation stone in the edifice of Christ's Church; but he was not the foundation—the rock—on which the Church was built. That rock was the Redeemer; "for no one can lay another foundation," as your own version expresses it (1 Cor. iii. 11.), "but that which is laid: which is Christ Jesus."

But there is a strange error based upon a text in the Gospel of St. John, which several of the popes of Rome have advanced, in their solicitude to find authority for

their favourite doctrine. It is thus stated by Vigilius, in a letter to Eleutherius:

"Although the election of all the apostles was the same, yet it was granted to the blessed Peter that he should be raised above the rest; whence he was called Cephas, because he was the head and the first of all the apostles; and what precedes in the head, must necessarily be followed in the members[1]." And again, in one of the supposititious decretal epistles, attributed to pope Anacletus, "It was granted to Peter that he should go before the others as Cephas, and chief of the apostolate;" and the same idea occurs many times, being justified ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς, as they tell us[2].

Now this assertion is peculiarly unfortunate, for it is directly opposed to the apostle John, and to the plain meaning of the language to which the word belongs. For the expression used by our Lord is this: "*Thou art Simon the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, which is interpreted Peter.*" In the Greek, this latter name is Πέτρος, signifying a stone, as has been explained already; in the Latin, Petrus; in English, Peter. But the name Cephas is a Hebrew word; and hence St. John here, as in some other places, sets down the Hebrew first, and then adds the Greek interpretation. Our Lord did not give the apostle two new names, but one. It appears to us in two shapes, indeed, because the Saviour spoke in Hebrew, and St. John wrote in Greek; but they have the same signification. The true original, therefore, of this celebrated name is כֵּיפָא (kepha), the Hebrew word signifying a stone, derived from כֵּיף (kiph) a rock. From

[1] Mansi Concil. tom. i. p. 75. "Quoniam licet omnium apostolorum par electio, Beato Petro tamen concessum est, ut ceteris præmineret: unde et Cephas vocatur, quia caput et primus est omnium apostolorum: et quod in capite præcessit, in membris sequi necessum est."

[2] Mansi Concil. tom. i. p. 617.

this simple explanation, it is plain that the passage, properly understood, has no imaginable connexion with the doctrine which has vainly sought support from it. Doubtless, brethren, most of you know this; but still, the extravagance is found in your books, without any corrective; and as it might mislead some ignorant minds, it is perhaps as well to mention it.

Let us now proceed to ascertain how far your doctrine accords with the other evidence of Scripture.

First, then, we read of many occasions in which the apostles were anxious about the point of supremacy; but in every instance the Redeemer discouraged them, and inculcated an humble equality. Thus (Matt. xx. 25.) when the mother of James and John desired a superior place for her sons, and the other apostles were moved with indignation, it is recorded that "Jesus called them to him, and said, You know that the princes of the Gentiles lord it over them; and they that are the greater exercise power upon them. IT SHALL NOT BE SO AMONG YOU: but whosoever will be the greater among you, let him be your minister; and he who would be first among you, shall be your servant."

Again (Matt. xxiii. 8.), warning his apostles against the love of superior station, he saith, "Be ye not called Rabbi. For one is your master, and ALL YOU ARE BRETHREN."

Again (Luke ix. 46.), we read that "there entered a thought into them, which of them should be the greater. But Jesus, seeing the thoughts of their heart, took a child and set him by him, and said to them, Whosoever shall receive this child in my name, receiveth me; and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth him that sent me. For he that is the least among you all, he is the greatest."

Again (Luke xxii. 24.), "There was a strife amongst them, which of them should seem to be greater. And he

said to them, The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them, and they that have power over them are called beneficent. But you not so: but he who is the greatest among you, let him be as the least, and he that is the leader as he that serveth. For which is greater, he that sitteth at table, or he that serveth? Is not he that sitteth at table? But I am in the midst of you as he that serveth. And you are they who have continued with me in my temptations. And I appoint to you, as my Father hath appointed to me, a kingdom. That you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and may sit upon thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

Now all these instances are related as occurring *subsequently* to the gift of the keys to Peter, and the promise that the Church should be built on the rock, &c. which you interpret to be the grant of his supremacy. So that neither Peter nor his brethren could have understood this promise of Christ as you do; for if they had, they surely would not afterwards have disputed which of them should be the greatest. They must have looked on that question as perfectly settled in Peter's favour, and would have regarded him with deference accordingly. Neither does our Lord's language agree with your doctrine; for instead of discouraging the whole inquiry, and inculcating fraternal equality amongst them, he would, as it seems to me, on your supposition, have reproved their want of acquiescence in His declared will, and have reminded them that He had constituted Peter the *governor and chief* already.

But this is not the whole of the Scriptural objection to your notion of Peter's supremacy; for in the twentieth chapter of St. John's Gospel we read (ver. 22) that after our Lord's resurrection He came into the room where the disciples were gathered together, and said to them, "Peace be to you. As the Father hath sent me, I also

send you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose you shall retain, they are retained." Now I ask you, was not Peter included in this solemn transaction? The power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven you allow to be the power of remitting sin, or authoritatively pronouncing forgiveness. This grant was indeed first *promised* to Peter; but was it actually conferred on him, until the Saviour gave the spiritual faculty, by breathing on him, and saying, Receive ye the Holy Ghost? And in this actual conferring of the power are not the other apostles included, without distinction or difference? Hence, as the character of an office is not to be determined by the time when it was first promised, but by the rights actually conferred, it seems abundantly evident that this passage decides the whole controversy. Peter, indeed, was the first to acknowledge Christ, and therefore he was the first to receive the promise of the apostolic commission. But as in the parable of the householder the Lord said, I will give unto this last even as unto thee, so when we come to the actual conferring of the spiritual faculty, by which alone the power of binding and loosing can be exercised, we find no difference between the first and the last. All the apostles are breathed upon; all receive the Holy Ghost; to all it is said, "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." Peter has his part among the rest in the powers of this high commission; but there is no more hint of any supremacy over his brethren in its exercise, than there is in the promise of the final reward, where the Redeemer had said, that the apostles should sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

To that part of your theory which claims St. Peter as the first bishop of Rome, there is an objection in the very terms of the Saviour's charge, recorded in St. Mark's

gospel (xvi. 15), "Go ye into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." For it is perfectly evident that this precept could not consist with the apostles' confining themselves to a particular diocese, as you say St. Peter did, for seven years to Antioch, and twenty-five to Rome. The whole world was the field committed to thirteen chief labourers; and it seems hard to suppose that any one of them was authorized or intended to fix himself in a particular city as its bishop for such a length of time. In accordance with this remark, I shall presently cite to you, from Irenæus, the oldest list of the bishops of Rome extant, in which Linus, and not St. Peter, is set down as the first bishop of that city.

But passing over this point, let us proceed to ascertain how the rest of the Scripture evidence accords with your doctrine, that St. Peter was the chief ruler and governor of the other apostles. And here we shall find many difficulties in the way of your hypothesis, which I confess myself unable to solve.

In that invaluable record called the Acts of the Apostles, Peter appears prominently on several important occasions, as a speaker, a preacher, and a worker of miracles; but in no instance does he appear to assert or to exercise any superior power or dominion, such as you claim for the bishop of Rome over the other bishops. So far from it, that on some of these occasions he looks like one more ruled than ruling. Thus, when the conversion of the Samaritans, through the ministry of Philip, was made known to the apostles who were in Jerusalem (Acts viii. 14), "*they* sent to them Peter and John." Here is an inversion of authority. Instead of Peter sending the other apostles, they sent him. Again, (Acts xi. 2), when Peter returned from the conversion and baptism of Cornelius, and "was come up to Jerusalem, they who were of the circumcision disputed against him;"

and Peter explains the whole matter, concluding in the 17th verse by saying, "Who was I, that I could oppose God?" Neither he nor his accusers, on this occasion, seem to have had any notion of his superior dignity, as "bearing the person of Christ upon earth," in the words of your Canon law, and being the chief ruler and governor, to whom, in the gift of the keys, "the plenitude of power" was granted, according to your Doway commentary.

Again (Acts xv.), we read that the apostles and elders came together to consider of the question, whether the gentile converts should be bound by the ceremonial law; and this is what is commonly called the first apostolic council. But if it is to serve, according to your doctrine, as the example and warrant by which the other councils of the Church should still be holden, the place of Peter seems strangely inconsistent with the authority claimed for him by the bishop of Rome. For he does not appear to have summoned this council, nor to have presided in it, nor to have opened its proceedings, nor to have framed its definitive decree, nor to have performed any subsequent act of formal approbation. The apostles and ancients came together"—"When there was much disputing, Peter rose up and said," &c. After he had concluded his address, Barnabas and Paul (v. 12) related "what great signs and wonders God had wrought among the gentiles by them." "And after they had held their peace, James answered, saying, Men, brethren, hear me. Simon hath told in what manner God first visited the gentiles, to take out of them a people to his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets, as it is written," &c. "Wherefore *I judge*," continues the apostle James (v. 19), "that they who from among the gentiles are converted to God are not to be disquieted," &c. "*Then it pleased the apostles and ancients, with the whole Church*, to choose men of their own company, and to send them

to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas: Judas, who was surnamed Barsabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren, writing by their hand: *The apostles and ancients, brethren, to the brethren of the gentiles, greeting,*" &c. Now in all this transaction, where is the least appearance of Peter's supremacy? What is there that looks like the assertion of your Doway catechism, that "the rest of the apostles were Peter's sheep, and he their head or pastor?" What is there that looks like Peter's "holding the place of the Redeemer himself upon the earth," and "bearing the authority, not of a mere man, but of the true God," in the language of your canon law?

But the evidence of Scripture does not rest here. We find the whole of the remaining chapters of the book of the Acts devoted chiefly to the labours of the great apostle of the gentiles, and Peter is hardly named again. Nor, if we take the record of the sacred history in its own integrity, can it be fairly questioned, that if any supremacy had been conferred on one apostle above the others, the claim of Paul to that supremacy stands on by far the stronger ground. Peter was indeed called first, and Paul last; but it is not inconsistent with the divine government, that the first should be last, and the last first, and that the elder should serve the younger. The call of Peter was like that of the other apostles, but Paul was converted by a vision, and called in connexion with a miracle. His labours, his gifts, his sufferings, his share in the epistolary portion of the New Testament, his comprehensive, deep, and truly extraordinary knowledge of divine truth, his being raised up into heaven, where he heard things not lawful for man to utter—take the whole together, brethren, and surely it cannot be disputed that the weight of the Scriptural evidence is greatly in his favour.

There are two points, however, which seem conclusive to my mind on this branch of our subject; one, that St.

Paul himself allows no supremacy to St. Peter; the other, that the book of the Acts clearly makes him, and not St. Peter, the first founder of the Church at Rome.

On the first of these points, let us hear St. Paul himself in his epistle to the Galatians (i. 15): "When it pleased Him," saith this great apostle, "who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by His grace to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the gentiles, immediately *I conferred not with flesh and blood, neither went I to Jerusalem to the apostles who were before me;* but I went into Arabia, and again I returned to Damascus. Then, three years after, I came to Jerusalem to see Peter, and stayed with him fifteen days: but other of the apostles I saw none, except James, the brother of the Lord." "Then fourteen years after, I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus also with me. And I went up according to revelation, and communicated the Gospel which I preach among the gentiles, but apart to them who seemed to be something, lest perhaps I should run, or had run, in vain. But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised, but because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privately to spy our liberty, which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage. To whom *we yielded not by subjection, no, not for an hour*, that the truth of the Gospel might continue with you." (Gal. ii. 1—5.)

"But of them who seemed to be something," continues the apostle, "(what they were some time, it is nothing to me; God accepteth not the person of man) for to me, *they that seemed to be something, added nothing.* But on the contrary, when they had seen that *to me was committed the Gospel of the uncircumcision*, as *to Peter was that of the circumcision;* (for he who wrought in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, wrought in me also among

the gentiles). And when they had known the grace that was given to me, *James and Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars*, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship: that *we should go to the gentiles, and they to the circumcision.*" "But when Cephas was come to Antioch, *I withstood him to the face, because he was blameable.* For before that some came from James, he did eat with the gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, *fearing those of the circumcision. And to his dissimulation the rest of the Jews consented;* so that Barnabas also was led by them into that dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly unto the truth of the Gospel, I said to Cephas, before them all: If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the gentiles, and not of the Jews, how dost thou compel the gentiles to follow the way of the Jews?"

Now, I ask you, brethren, to ponder these extracts from the writings of St. Paul, and see how totally incompatible they are with your doctrine of St. Peter's supremacy. Here is this great teacher, whom the fathers so continually call the "elect vessel," exercising his apostleship for three years without conferring at all with the other apostles; then visiting Peter, of whom he speaks without any note of distinction: then fourteen years after, visiting Jerusalem again, mentioning those who seemed to be something, with an express denial that they added any thing to him, and as express a declaration, that the chief care of the gentiles was committed to him, as the chief care of the Jewish converts was to Peter: then speaking of Peter, along with James, and John, as pillars, but, (observe it, brethren) not even giving the first place to Peter, but to James: then taxing Peter with inconsistency, and withstanding him to the face, and openly rebuking him for his dissimulation, expressly declaring that Peter feared them of the circumcision,—and I pray

you, say, whether it is possible to conceive that St. Paul knew, all this time, that he was writing about the ruler and governor of the whole Church, the prince of the apostles, with respect to whom the other apostles were sheep, and he their head and pastor; yea, who represented the person of Christ himself upon the earth, and exercised the authority, not of a mere man, but of the true God. These words, which are the very expressions of your Doway catechism and your canon law, have only to be compared in sober sincerity with the epistle to the Galatians, to convince any candid mind, as it seems to me, of their total inconsistency. And as the apostle Paul knew the mind of the Spirit, and the polity of Christ's Church, with the unerring certainty of inspiration, his testimony surely should be decisive.

On the other point, viz. that Paul, and not Peter, was the first founder of the Church of Rome, the Book of the Acts is clear and positive. For we read (xix. 21.) that "Paul purposed in the Spirit, as soon as he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem, saying: After I have been there I must also see Rome." Again, (Ch. xxiii. 11.) the Lord standing by him said: "Be constant; for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome." Then in the 28th chapter, his arrival in that city is related, with many interesting particulars, and the book ends with stating that "he remained there two whole years in his own hired lodging, and received all that came in to him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching the things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ with all confidence, without prohibition." With what success his labours were attended, we learn from his epistle to the Romans, (i. 8.) where he saith, "I give thanks to my God through Jesus Christ for you all; because your faith is spoken of in the whole world." Now inasmuch as St.

Paul was in an especial manner the apostle of the gentiles—as James, Peter, and John had given to him the right hand of fellowship, (Gal. ii.) and it was settled between them that they should go to the Jews, and he to the gentiles—as Rome was the chief city of the gentiles, and Paul purposed "in the Spirit," that is, by divine suggestion, to go there,—as he was encouraged in his purpose by a vision, and safely conducted on his way, and preached successfully two years, while not one word appears of Peter's labours in that quarter,—I have certainly the fullest evidence that the Lord appointed him and not Peter to that special work, and that the Holy Spirit, in dictating to the evangelist Luke what circumstances should be handed down to the Church in the inspired history of the Acts of the Apostles, thought it good to record this important fact, to be a standing memorial to the end of time. That after all this, brethren, St. Paul should be made to act a secondary part to St. Peter in founding the Church of Rome, and that the sacred oracles should thus become subordinate to the testimony of tradition, is only one of many strange things which meet the eye of investigation, when employed upon the subject of your exclusive claims.

To conclude this branch of the evidence, it may be necessary to remind you, that in the two epistles of St. Peter there is not one word intimating the supreme rule and government supposed to be conferred on him. In St. Paul's epistles, we have several strong allusions to the apostolic rod, and the delivering persons to Satan as a consequence of his ecclesiastical judgment. And St. John refers very plainly to his authority where he speaks of Diotrephes. But St. Peter neither speaks of his powers himself, nor does any other apostolic writer speak of them for him; so that the whole tenor of Scripture seems, to my mind, irreconcilably hostile to your doc-

trine. Some of the proof is positive, some negative, some circumstantial; but the result, one would suppose, could hardly be mistaken. And yet, you make this very doctrine an article of faith, necessary to salvation! Have you never wondered, brethren, that the Acts of the Apostles, and the twenty-one epistles of the New Testament, should contain so much that might have been omitted, in the rich abundance of their treasures, while yet the supremacy of Peter, although essential, as you imagine, to the very being of the Church, should have been so strangely passed by?

CHAPTER V.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

THE first writings which your voluminous works on the councils of the Church offer to their readers, are the apostolical canons, the apostolical constitutions, and the decretal epistles of the early bishops of Rome.

Of the first of these, the apostolical canons, your authors, as you are aware, speak with high respect. They do not indeed, consider them the true productions of the apostles; but yet they are supposed to be recognized by the councils, and are therefore entitled to great regard [1]. Be this supposition right or wrong, it is enough for our present purpose to state the fact, that not one of the eighty-four canons according to one version, or the fifty according to another, furnishes the slightest warrant for your claims to universal dominion. They speak largely of the bishop, priest, and deacon, but not a word of Peter's supremacy, of the high prerogatives of the Roman bishop, of the mother and mistress Church of Rome, or of any thing which resembles in the least your present doctrine.

[1] Of the apostolical canons, Dionysius Exiguus says: (see Mansi Concil. tom. i. p. 3.) "In principio canones qui dicuntur Apostolorum, de Græco transtulimus, *quibus plurimi consensum non præbuere facilem.*" And Isidorus Mercator says, (ib. p. 6.) "Denique propter eorum auctoritatem cæteris conciliis præposuimus canones, qui dicuntur Apostolorum, *licet a quibusdam apocryphi dicantur.*"

To shew, however, distinctly, my authority for this assertion, it may be as well to quote those canons which exhibit the genuine ecclesiastical polity of the primitive day.

Thus, canon 13th (in the Greek code) stands thus: "It is not lawful for a bishop to leave his diocese in order to take charge of another, even although he is constrained by many: unless it be fit for some reasonable cause, as for the greater gain which he may confer on the inhabitants thereof in respect of piety, and this shall not be decided upon by himself, but by *the judgment and most urgent exhortation of many bishops*[1]."

You remember, brethren, that your canon submits the translation of bishops to the pope alone. Here it is submitted to the judgment of *many bishops*, of course, to a council. The difference is too manifest to be mistaken.

The thirty-third canon gives us a further proof of the same kind. "It is necessary that the bishops of each nation should know him who is first among them, and esteem him as their head; and that they should do nothing of difficulty or of great moment, without his opinion; and each of them should take heed to do those things which belong to his own diocese, and to the villages which are under his authority. But neither should the primate do any thing without the opinion of all. For thus shall concord continue, and God will be glorified, through our Lord Jesus Christ[2]."

[1] Mansi Concil. tom. i. p. 31. "Episcopo non liceat sua relicta parochia ad aliam transilire, etiamsi a pluribus cogatur: nisi sit aliqua causa rationi consentanea, quæ eum cogat hoc facere, utpote ad majus lucrum, cum possit ipse iis, qui illic habitant, pietatis verbo conferre; idque non ex se, sed multorum episcoporum judicio et maxima exhortatione."

[2] Ibid. 35. "Episcopos uniuscujusque gentis nosse oportet eum qui in eis est primus, et existimare ut caput: et nihil facere, quod sit arduum aut magni momenti, præter illius sententiam: illa autem facere unumquemque, quæ ad suam parochiam pertinent, et pagos qui ei subsunt. Sed nec ille absque omnium sententia aliquid agat. Sic enim erit concordia, et glorificabitur Deus per Dominum Jesum Christum."

The comment of Binnius himself upon this canon, zealous as he is for your claims, interprets it rightly of the *metropolitan* bishops. "The Council of Nice," saith he, "and the council of Ephesus follow these apostolic canons, decreeing that every bishop should *acknowledge his primate and metropolitan*." But here is not one word of your fundamental doctrine of obedience to the supposed chief ruler, the bishop of Rome [1].

Once more, the thirty-sixth canon provides, that "Twice in the year, a council of bishops shall assemble and examine amongst themselves the decrees of religion, and settle all the ecclesiastical controversies that may occur: once in the fourth week of Pentecost, and again on the twelfth day of October [2]."

The same principle is here carried out, viz. the determining disputes on all religious questions *in a council*, instead of taking them by appeal, according to your doctrine, before the single judgment of the pope.

Lastly, the seventy-eighth canon has these words: "A bishop accused of any delinquency by men of credit, must be called to answer by the bishops: and if he appears and confesses or is convicted, the punishment shall be decreed. But if being summoned, he does not obey, let him be called the second time, by two bishops sent to him for that purpose. And if he does not obey this call, let him be summoned a third time, by two bishops more. But if he then, contumaciously despising them, does not appear, the council may give sentence on those

[1] Ibid. 61. E. "Nicæna Synodus can. 6. et Ephesina illis actis quæ post 7. Can. edita sunt, hos canones Apostolorum sequuntur, statuentes ut singuli Episcopi suum primum et metropolitanum agnoscant," &c.

[2] Ibid. 35. E. "Bis in anno fiat episcoporum Synodus, et inter se examinent decreta religionis, et incidentes ecclesiasticas controversias componant; semel quidem quarta hebdomada Pentecostes, iterum autem Hyperberetæi duodecimo."

points which they see proved, lest he should seem to profit by flying from judgment[1]."

Here is the precise course taken by the primitive Church against all the early heretics: viz. they were called before a council, and not before the pope. So that we have the decisive testimony of this most venerable relic of antiquity, directly adverse to your doctrine. How the evidence can be fairly evaded, brethren, I confess myself unable to imagine.

[1] Ibid. 43. "Episcopum a viris fide dignis ob aliquid accusatum, ipsum ab episcopis vocari necesse est: et si se quidem stiterit, et confessus vel convictus sit, statuatur pœna. Si autem vocatus non paruerit, secundo etiam vocetur, missis ad ipsum episcopis duobus. Si etiam sic non obedierit, vocetur et tertio, duobus ad eum rursus missis episcopis. Si autem vel sic aspernans et contumax se non stiterit, Synodus ea quæ videntur, adversus eum pronunciet, ne lucrifacere videatur, dum judicium subterfugit."

CHAPTER VI.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

THE next piece of antiquity which comes under the name of the apostles, is called the Apostolical Constitutions, and purports, as you are doubtless well aware, to be a complete body of ecclesiastical doctrine, government, and worship, set forth by all the apostles in council, Clement of Rome acting as their notary. This claim of apostolic authority is universally denied by your writers; but nevertheless they warmly applaud the work, as containing nothing inconsistent with the system of the four first centuries, as being the chief fountain of ecclesiastical doctrine and practice in the Greek Church, and as being very useful, nay, necessary to be known by every one studious of Christian antiquity. Your scholars think its probable age was A.D. 309, but as it is styled apostolical, and as you present it, for that reason, amongst the earliest records of the Church, I take it as you give it to me [1].

[1] Your learned Philip Labbe S. I. (Mansi Concil. tom. i. p. 254. declares the Apostolic Constitutions to be "Uberrimum illum universi fere apud Græcos canonici juris fontem et disciplinæ Ecclesiasticæ thesaurum in plerisque locupletissimum πᾶσαν κανονικὴν τάξιν, ut docet Epiphanius, complectentem."——"Satisque constare, nihil quicquam in iis reperivi, quod Ecclesiasticæ quatuor primorum sæculorum disciplinæ consentaneum non sit," &c. And again, your learned editor says :

For myself, I must frankly say, that I have read nothing of ancient times with more interest than these constitutions. They are rich in doctrine, in eloquence, and in forms of devotion; and curious in point of ceremonial detail. But I have searched them in vain for any trace of your doctrine on the primacy of Peter, the vicarious authority of the bishop, or the maternal dignity of the Church of Rome. So far from this is the aspect of the primitive Church presented throughout the eight books of the apostolic constitutions, that the most absolute equality appears in the episcopal office, and amongst the apostles themselves. A few specimens of the mode in which the subject is treated may be desirable.

The caption of the whole work is a specimen of this equality. "The apostles and elders, to all who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, throughout the nations, grace be to you and peace from Almighty God," &c.[1]

Another specimen is furnished in the following passage: "On account of these things also, we ourselves, being gathered together in one, Peter, Andrew, James and John, the sons of Zebedee, Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, and Matthew, James of Alpheus, and Lebbeus

(Mansi Concil. tom. i. 254.) "Constitutiones quas vocant apostolicas opus esse spurium, ab iis, quibus adscribuntur, apostolis, tum et ab ipsa apostolorum ætate penitus alienum, nemo Theologus modo ignorat vel diffitetur."

Ibid. 256. "Quæ si conjecturæ admittantur, intra spatium illud, quod anno 309 et 325 concluditur, vulgatarum Constitutionum sedes figenda est."

"Utcumque res habeat sese, utile est opus ad multa, et dogmatum nostrorum vetustati adstruendæ apprime necessarium."

[1] Mansi Concil. Tom. 1. p. 274. "Constitutiones quæ tribuuntur apostolis."

"Apostoli et presbyteri omnibus qui ex gentibus in Dominum Jesum Christum credidistis, gratia vobis, et pax ab Omnipotente Deo," &c.

whose surname is Thaddeus, Simon the Canaanite, and Matthias, who was elected in our number in the place of Judas, and James the brother of our Lord, the same who is the bishop of Jerusalem, also Paul, the doctor of the Gentiles and the chosen vessel, all, I say, gathered together in one, have written to you this catholic doctrine to support and confirm you, to whom the episcopal office every where is entrusted. In which doctrine we set forth these things to you: that there is only one God, Almighty, and besides him there is no other, and he can only be worshipped and adored through Jesus Christ our Lord by the Holy Spirit: also, that the Holy Scriptures must be used, the law and the prophets, that parents must be honoured, that every evil action must be avoided, that the resurrection and the judgment must be believed, that a final reward must be expected, that all creatures may be used in food, with giving of thanks, since they are of God," &c. [1]

Another specimen of the same: "Therefore, we, the twelve apostles of the Lord who are together, have marked out to you the constitutions of every ecclesiastical matter, Paul, the chosen vessel, and our brother apostle,

[1] Ibid. Lib. vi. Cap. 14. p. 458. "Propter quæ et ipsi nunc in unum congregati, Petrus, Andreas, Jacobus et Joannes filii Zebedæi, Philippus, Bartholomæus, Thomas et Matthæus, Jacobus Alphæi, et Lebbæus cognomento Thaddæus, Simon Chananæus, et Matthias, qui loco Judæ in numerum nostrum electus est, et Jacobus frater Domini, idemque Hierosolymitanus episcopus, item Paulus Doctor Gentium ac vas electionis, omnes, inquam, in unum congregati scripsimus vobis catholicam hanc doctrinam ad fulciendum ac confirmandum vos, quibus universalis episcopatus creditus est. In qua doctrina hæc vobis exponimus. Deum omnipotentem unum tantum esse, ac præter hunc neminem alium esse, oportereque hunc solummodo colere ac venerari per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum in Sancto Spiritu: item uti scripturis sacris, lege et prophetis, honorare parentes, omnem actionem pravam fugere, resurrectionem et judicium credere, remunerationem expectare, omnibus creaturis in cibo uti cum gratiarum actione, utpote a Deo factis," &c.

being present, and James the bishop, and the other elders and the seven deacons."

"I therefore, Peter, say first, that the bishop is to be ordained as we have all decreed alike already," &c. [1]

"I, James, the brother of John, the son of Zebedee, say, let the deacon proclaim:" (previous to the administration of the eucharist) "no catechumen must approach, no one of the hearers, no one of the unbelievers, no one of the heretics," &c.[2]

"Concerning the ordination of the presbyters, I, the beloved of the Lord, (sc. John,) appoint to you bishops: when thou ordainest a presbyter, O bishop, place thy hand upon his head, the presbyters and deacons standing by." &c. [3]

"But concerning the ordination of deacons, I Philip, decree that thou, O bishop, shalt ordain the deacon, by the laying on of thy hands, all the presbyters and deacons being present," &c. [4]

"And concerning the deaconess, I, Bartholomew, appoint, that thou, O bishop, shalt lay hands on her, in

[1] Ibid. Lib. 8. cap. 4. p. 538. "Nos igitur duodecim apostoli Domini, qui una sumus, has vobis constitutiones de omni ecclesiastica forma indicimus, præsente Paulo vase electionis, et co-apostolo nostro, et Jacobo episcopo ac reliquis presbyteris et septem diaconis. Ego igitur primus Petrus dico ordinandum esse episcopum, ut omnes pariter antea constituimus," &c.

[2] Ib. cap. 12. p. 551. "Dico ego Jacobus frater Joannis Zebedæi, ut statim edicat diaconus: Ne quis ex catechumenis: ne quis ex audientibus: ne quis ex infidelibus: ne quis ex hæreticis," &c.

[3] Ib. cap. 16. p. 567. "De ordinatione presbyterorum ego dilectus a Domino constituo vobis episcopis: Cum presbyterum ordinas, episcope, impone ipse manum capiti presbyteri, astantibus tibi presbyteris et diaconis," &c.

[4] Ib. cap. 17. p. 570. "De ordinatione vero diaconorum ego Philippus constituo, ut diaconum ordines, episcope, imponendo manus præsentibus omnibus presbyteris, et diaconis," &c.

the presence of the presbyters, the deacons, and the deaconesses," &c.[1]

"I, Simon, the Canaanite, decree the number of bishops by whom a bishop ought to be ordained, namely, by two or three," &c.[2]

"And I, Paul, the least of the apostles, appoint to you bishops and presbyters, concerning the canons," &c.[3]

Such passages, brethren, might be greatly multiplied; but these specimens, I trust, are sufficient to shew the simplicity and equality with which the powers of the apostles are exhibited in this interesting record of antiquity. Can these extracts be fairly reconciled with your doctrine, that Peter was the *prince* of the apostles, and the ruler over the rest, that "he was their pastor, and they his sheep," &c?

But, to conclude our citations from this work, I shall ask your attention to one passage more, where the episcopal jurisdiction is mentioned: "To you, bishops, it is said, *Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed also in heaven*[4]." Here we have the very language which the Saviour addressed to Peter, used in the plural form, and applied to all bishops without distinction or difference, agreeing admirably with the sentiment of

[1] Ib. cap. 18. "De diaconissa vero ego Bartholomæus constituo ut manus ei, episcope, imponas præsentibus presbyteris, et diaconis ac diaconissis."

[2] Ib. cap. 27. p. 575. "Ego Simon Cananæus constituo a quot episcopis debeat ordinari episcopus, scilicet a duobus, aut tribus episcopis," &c.

[3] Ib. cap. 32. p. 578. "Et ego Paulus minimus apostolorum, hæc vobis episcopis et presbyteris de canonibus constituo," &c.

[4] Ib. lib. ii. cap. xi. p. 298. "Vobis episcopis dictum est: Quodcunque ligaveritis super terram, erit ligatum et in cœlo, et quodcunque solveritis super terram, erit solutum et in cœlo."

the final chapter, where Christ is called the "High Priest, the pontiff, the bishop of all [1]."

Surely, then, we cannot differ in the conclusion, that neither the apostolical canons, nor the apostolical constitutions yield any support to your doctrine. To my mind, a far stronger inference appears equally plain, that these relics of antiquity are altogether inconsistent with your claim, and do of themselves go far to prove, that the primitive Church of Rome held no such principle.

[1] Id. 594. D. E. "Omnium episcopum, et Pontificem Christum, Jesum Dominum nostrum."

CHAPTER VII.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

WE come next to the decretal epistles, which purport, as you know, to be the authoritative decrees and letters of the earlier bishops or popes of Rome, recorded in the pontifical book of pope Damasus. These writings are of a very different character from the subjects of my last chapter. The favourite topic which runs through them all, is the authority of the Roman see, the supremacy of Peter, and the dignity of that Church which claims to be the mother and mistress of all the Churches. And if they were genuine, they would be entitled to great weight in settling the antiquity, if not the divine right, of this your fundamental doctrine.

But here, brethren, is the difficulty. These decretal epistles are forgeries, and admitted to be so by all your own enlightened men. It is believed, on the authority of Hincmar, that they were the fruits of the dishonest zeal of Riculfus, who was the bishop of Moguntum, A.D. 787, and who, finding that the authority of the pope needed support in France, devised these false documents in the hope of sustaining it.

Certain it is, by the plain statement of your own writers, that they began to be published about A.D. 836, and that pope Nicolas I. A.D. 865, contended strongly with the French clergy, in order to have these forgeries re-

ceived. Through his efforts and those of his successors, they did by degrees obtain credit amongst the western Churches. But their falsehood was exposed in full light after the reformation, and has been acknowledged for a long period amongst all candid men of your own communion. For proof of what is here asserted, I refer to the extracts below, where you will find, that although Binius and Turrianus were weak and bigotted enough to write in defence of these frauds, yet the great mass of your eminent scholars united in their condemnation. The language of your famous Labbe is particularly strong. "They are so deformed," saith he, "in the eyes of all discerning men, that no art, no paint, whether white or red, can disguise them [1]."

Brethren, what think you of the fact thus candidly

[1] Observatio Philip Labbe, S. I. Mansi Concil. tom. i. p. 86. "Mirum est viris doctissimis Turriano, Binio, et quibusdam aliis in tanta eruditionis ecclesiasticæ luce probari potuisse decretales illas epistolas, a quocumque, seu mercatore, seu peccatore fabricatas, et antiquis Romanæ urbis Pontificibus circiter annum Christianæ epochæ octingentesimum suppositas: adeo enim perspicacibus viris deformes videntur hoc saltem tempore, ut nulla arte, nulla cerussa aut purpurisso fucari possint. Eas omnes, saltem plerasque earum repudiarunt eruditissimi quique tractatores Catholici, Baronius, Bellarminus, Perronius, Contius, Antonius Augustinus, Lorinus, Sirmondus, Ducæus, Petavius, Marca, Bosquetus, ut alios modo, sive antiquiores, sive recentiores, silentio obvolvam."

Ib. p. 87. "Antiquo juri universalis Ecclesiæ assensu roborato, successit *Jussum Novum*, quod ab anno 836 publicari cœpit, et adnitente Nicolao I. et cæteris Romanis pontificibus paulatim usu invaluit per occidentis provincias."

Ib. p. 89. "Riculfus autem, a quo publicatam fuisse docet Hincmarus, Ecclesiam Moguntiacam tenuit ab anno 787, usque ad annum 814, et Sedem Apostolicam devote coluit; ut testis est auctor præfationis ad Benedicti Levitæ collectionem. Quod fortasse illi epistolarum interpolandarum desiderium injecit, ut labantem Romanæ Ecclesiæ auctoritatem in Galliis restauraret."

Ib. p. 90. "E. Contenderat tamen Nicolaus literis ad universos Galliæ Episcopos datis anno 865, ut decreta illa reciperentur, et magno conatu Gallicanorum Episcoporum argumenta repulerat."

admitted by your own authors? That the admission is honourable to their honesty, I gladly acknowledge. That it does them credit as lovers of historic truth, I freely allow. That it clears the character of your Church at the present day from all participation in this nefarious management, is equally undeniable; and I bear my testimony thus far, with unfeigned satisfaction, in favour of the personal integrity which your frank dealing has exhibited. But may I rest it here? Are there not some suggestions presented to every mind of common reflection by the existence of such a fraud, which brings a dark cloud upon the very character of the claim itself? Does not the admission, that the ninth century gave birth to such an imposture, executed by a bishop and patronized by successive popes, cast a mist of melancholy suspicion upon the whole sanctuary of ecclesiastical faith, and force a sigh of deep regret over the shame of men who could palter with every principle of truth while they boasted of infallibility?

Avoid them as we may, brethren, these questions will obtrude themselves upon us. Why were these epistles forged, if the prerogatives of St. Peter and his successors were in reality admitted to be then what your Canon law states them to be now? Why should men, high in office, and having much to lose by a failure in such an attempt, artfully concoct a scheme of imposition, for the sake of establishing a claim which was protected by divine right already? And if it be undenied and undeniable, that forgeries so extensive were actually palmed upon the Churches, for many ages, by the successors of Nicolas I. —the supposed chief rulers and governors, who held the place of Christ upon the earth, and had committed to them the plenitude of power—what security have we for the pure and faithful guardianship of the other books,

which came down to us, through the same hands, from the same remote antiquity?

But I turn from the prosecution of this theme, my brethren. It is not necessary to my argument to press it farther; and no mind of true Christian feeling would desire to dwell on it longer than necessity required. Unhappily for the credit of ecclesiastical fidelity, other occasions will present themselves in the progress of our inquiry, where the same fault will call for the same reprehension. But, perhaps, though the spirit of the bishop of Moguntum and pope Nicolas I. was not confined to their day nor to their persons, yet the decretal epistles constitute, on the whole, the boldest assault upon the truth of antiquity which was ever made in the service of ecclesiastical ambition.

CHAPTER VIII.

Brethren in Christ,

The earliest undoubted records which you present to us after the Scriptures, are the writings of the apostolic fathers, as they are called, from which nothing positive can be derived on the point in question. As a useful instance of circumstantial evidence, we shall by and by have occasion to note the conduct of Polycarp on the subject of the time of holding Easter. And in one of the Epistles of Ignatius, addressed to the Romans, his entire silence on the supposed pre-eminence of their Church, and the derived supremacy of Peter, looks altogether adverse to your claims. But the epistle of Clement, the bishop of Rome, to the Corinthians, expostulating with them on their deposing their ministers, and contending among themselves, will furnish us with a few passages, marking the simplicity of that early day. The date of this piece of antiquity is not far from A. D. 90. I shall cite it from your own Latin version.

"The Church of God which dwells at Rome, to the Church of God which dwells at Corinth, called and sanctified by the will of God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, grace and peace from Almighty God, through Jesus Christ, to each and all of you be multiplied[1]."—An

[1] Mansi Concil. tom. i. p. 171. "Ecclesia Dei quæ incolit Romam ecclesiæ Dei quæ incolit Corinthum, vocatis sanctificatis in voluntate Dei

humble beginning this! for Clement, instead of affecting to rule the Corinthians by his official power, unites with his Church in a fraternal expostulation.

"The apostles," continues Clement, "preached to us from Jesus Christ, Jesus Christ from God. Christ, therefore, was sent by God, and the apostles by Christ; each mission was performed in its own order, by the will of God. Therefore, having received their command from Him, and being certainly assured by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and confirmed in faith by the word of God, with the abundance and safeguard of the Holy Ghost, they went forth announcing the approach of the kingdom of God. Preaching, accordingly, through regions and cities, they appointed the first fruits of those whom they approved in the spirit, as bishops and deacons, over those who believed [1]." Here was an excellent opportunity to have introduced the supremacy of Peter, and the maternal authority of the Church of Rome; but Clement makes not the most distant allusion either to the one or to the other.

"Our apostles also," saith this primitive witness, "knew through our Lord Jesus Christ, that there would be contention about the title of episcopacy. Therefore, on this account, having obtained perfect foreknowledge, they appointed those of whom we have spoken before, and

per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, gratia et pax ab omnipotente Deo per Jesum Christum, in vobis singulis et erga vos invicem multiplicetur."

[1] Ibid. p. 202. "Apostoli nobis evangelizaverunt a Domino Jesu Christo, Jesus Christus a Deo. Missus est igitur Christus a Deo, et apostoli a Christo: factumque est utrumque ordinatim ex voluntate Dei. Itaque acceptis mandatis et certo persuasi per resurrectionem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et in fide confirmati per verbum Dei cum Spiritus Sancti plenitudine et securitate, egressi sunt annuntiantes adventurum esse regnum Dei. Prædicantes igitur per regiones ac urbes, primitias earum, spiritu cum probassent, in episcopos et diaconos eorum qui crediturі erant constituerunt."

delivered a rule thenceforward for the future succession, that when they departed, other approved men should take their office and ministry. Those, therefore, who were appointed by them, or after their time, by other distinguished men, with the consent of the whole Church, and who fulfilled their ministry to the sheepfold of Christ, humbly, quietly, and liberally, and through a long period secured the highest approbation from all men: those we think unjustly deposed from their office. Nor will it be accounted a light sin, if those who offer gifts without strife and with holiness, are removed from their episcopate[1]." In this passage, it seems difficult to imagine how Clement could avoid some allusion to his own jurisdiction, if he had understood it as being any thing like your canon law. The Corinthians had schismatically deposed their bishop and ministers, which they should not have attempted under any circumstances, according to your system. The canon law declares it to be, by divine right, the prerogative of the bishop of Rome, as chief ruler and governor, to depose bishops. All, therefore, that the Corinthians could legally have done, was to have preferred a complaint to the see of Peter. And in presuming to act without applying to the vicar of Christ, the pastor and prince over the whole Church under heaven, they showed themselves manifest despisers of

[1] Ibid. 203. "Apostoli quoque nostri per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum cognoverunt futuram esse de nomine episcopatus contentionem. Eam igitur ob causam, perfectam præcognitionem adepti, prædictos constituerunt, ac deinceps futuræ successionis hanc tradiderunt regulam, ut cum illi decessissent, ministerium eorum ac munus alii probati viri exciperent. Qui igitur ab illis, aut deinceps ab aliis viris eximiis, consentiente ecclesia universa constituti sunt, et ovili Christi humiliter, quiete, liberaliterque ministrarunt, ac longo tempore præclarum ab omnibus reportarunt testimonium: hos censemus officio injuste dejici. Non enim leve erit peccatum, si eos, qui citra querelam et sancte offerunt dona, ab episcopatu removerimus."

government, and guilty of an open contempt of the highest authority. Why does not Clement mention this feature in their conduct? Why does not the Church of Rome, writing to her subordinate subjects, assert her just rights as "the mother and mistress of all the Churches?" Why does not her bishop recognise, on such an occasion, his own official powers, and call the refractory Corinthians not only to a sense of their duty to their own pastors, but of their duty to himself, their chief pastor?

I confess, brethren, my utter inability to account for the total absence of these topics from this famous document of genuine antiquity, on any other hypothesis than this: Clement did not enforce the claims of the Church of Rome as the mother and mistress of Corinth, nor his own as their chief ruler, simply because those claims were not then in being. Hence he urges them to return to their duty, by the principles of the Gospel, and specially by the obligation of Christian charity, and concludes by this beautiful supplication:

"May God, the Inspector of all, the Lord of all spirits, the Master of all flesh, who chose our Lord Jesus Christ, and through Him elected us a peculiar people, give to every soul who shall invoke His holy and majestic name, faith, fear, peace, patience, equanimity, continence, purity, and temperance, to the praise of His name, through our High Priest and Advocate, Jesus Christ; through whom, to Him, be glory, majesty, power, honour, both now and for ever. Amen[1]."

[1] Ibid. 214. "Inspector omnium Deus, Spirituum Dominus, et herus universæ carnis, qui elegit Dominum Jesum Christum, et per eum nos in populum peculiarem, det omni animæ, quæ magnificum et sanctum nomen ejus invocaverit, timorem, pacem, patientiam, æquanimitatem, continentiam, puritatem et temperantiam, ut nomini ejus gratia sit, per summum sacerdotem et patronum nostrum Jesum Christum, per quem illi

Your industrious collectors give us several other epistles bearing the name of Clement, which, on some accounts, are both curious and interesting; but as they are admitted to be apocryphal amongst yourselves, and do not, even if they were genuine, allude to the point before us, it would be useless to waste our time upon them.

gloria, majestas, potentia, honor, et nunc et in omnia sæcula sæculorum. Amen."

CHAPTER IX.

Brethren in Christ,

The next of the fathers whose testimony I shall present to you, is Irenæus, who flourished in the second century, and to whose writings you always appeal, although, as I am well convinced, they may in vain be searched for any evidence in support of your present system. He speaks throughout of the Church as being founded by the apostles in general, and never mentions Peter as being entitled to any primacy over the rest. Nay, in his relation of the establishment of the very Church of Rome, he makes it the act of both Peter and Paul; and while he grants to that Church an important rank, he expresses himself in such a manner as is totally irreconcilable with your style at the present day. The passages which are most to the purpose are as follows:

"We have not known," saith he, "the system of our salvation, except by those, through whom the Gospel came to us; which at first they preached orally, but afterwards, by the will of God, delivered it to us in the Scriptures, to be the pillar and ground of our faith[1]." Here,

[1] "Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostræ cognovimus, quam per eos, per quos Evangelium pervenit ad nos; quod quidem tunc præconaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum et columnam fidei nostræ futurum."—Iren. Cont. Hæres. lib. 3. cap. 1.

you perceive, Irenæus calls the *Scriptures* the "pillar and ground of our faith," and refers this pillar and ground to the apostles generally, without distinction. A little farther on, he says that "Matthew, among the Hebrews, published the Gospel in their own language, Peter and Paul then preaching at Rome, and laying the foundation of the Church. After their departure, Mark, the scholar and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing what had been announced by Peter; and Luke, the follower of Paul, recorded in a book the Gospel that had been preached by him[1]." Here, though speaking on the very point, there is not a hint of Peter's supremacy, although it is plain that if Irenæus had known of such a doctrine, every motive of truth and interest would have combined to favour its publication.

But the third chapter of the same book presents a passage to which you frequently refer, and therefore I shall insert it at length, that its true meaning may be clearly seen.

Arguing against the Gnostic heretics of his day, Irenæus says, "The tradition of the apostles being manifested through all the world, it remains to be seen throughout the whole Church by those who wish to behold the truth. And we are able to enumerate those who were appointed bishops by the apostles in the Churches, and their successors to our own time, who taught and knew nothing like what these men rave about.—But since it would be tedious in such a volume, to reckon the successions of all the churches, we

[1] *Ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν, καὶ γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων, καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν· μετὰ δὲ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον, Μάρκος ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε· καὶ Λουκᾶς δὲ ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου, τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο.* Ib.

confound all those, who in any manner, whether through self gratification, or vain glory, or through blindness and evil opinion, infer what is unseemly, by the successions of the bishops of that greatest, most ancient and universally known Church, founded and constituted at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul, showing the tradition which it has from the apostles, and the faith announced to men, and descending even to us. For to this Church, on account of the more powerful principality, it must needs be that the whole Church should resort, that is, those who are faithful, on every side; in which the tradition which is from the apostles has always been preserved by those who are round about it[1]."

"The blessed apostles therefore founding and regulating this Church, delivered to Linus the work of the episcopate, of which Linus Paul makes mention in his epistle to Timothy. To him succeeded Anacletus, after him in the third place from the apostles, Clement is chosen to the episcopate, who saw the blessed apostles themselves, and resided with them, and had as yet their preaching and their tradition before his eyes: nor he alone, for at that time many survived who had been taught by the

[1] § 1. "Traditionem itaque apostolorum in toto mundo manifestatam, in omni Ecclesia adest respicere omnibus qui vera velint videre: et habemus annumerare eos qui ab apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi in Ecclesiis, et successores eorum usque ad nos, qui nihil tale docuerunt, neque cognoverunt, quale ab his deliratur."——§ 2. "Sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volumine omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare successiones; maximæ, antiquissimæ, et omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ Ecclesiæ, eam quam habet ab Apostolis traditionem, et annuntiatam hominibus fidem per successiones Episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos indicantes, confundimus omnes eos, qui quoquo modo, vel per sibi placentia, vel vanam gloriam, vel per cæcitatem et malam sententiam, præterquam oportet colligunt. Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio."

apostles. Under this Clement, a serious dissension having arisen among the brethren at Corinth, the Church which is at Rome wrote very powerful letters to the Corinthians, bringing them to peace, and repairing their faith, and enforcing the tradition which had been recently received from the apostles, announcing one Almighty God, the Maker of heaven and earth, the Creator of man, who had sent the deluge, and had called Abraham, who had brought forth his people out of Egypt, who talked with Moses, who appointed the law and sent the prophets, who prepared fire for the devil and his angels. That this father of our Lord Jesus Christ was announced by the Churches, those who will can learn from the Scripture itself, and can understand the apostolical tradition of the Church; since this is an epistle more ancient than these men, who now teach falsely, and pretend that there is another God above the Demiurgus who is the maker of all things. To this Clement Evaristus succeeded, and to Evaristus Alexander, and then Sixtus was constituted, the sixth after the apostles, and then Telesphorus, who also made a glorious martyrdom, and then Hyginus, afterwards Pius, after whom was Anicetus. To Anicetus succeeded Soter, and now, in the twelfth place from the apostles, Eleutherius holds the episcopate. By this ordination and succession, that tradition which is from the apostles in the Church, and the preaching of the truth, reach even to us."

"And also Polycarp, who was not only taught by the apostles, and had conversed with many of those who had seen Christ, but was even constituted bishop in the Church of Smyrna by the apostles who were in Asia, whom we also saw in our early youth, (for he persevered greatly, and at a very great age, making a glorious martyrdom, he departed this life,) he likewise taught always those things which he had learned from the

apostles, which he delivered to the Church, and which alone are true. To these things, all the Churches which are in Asia bear testimony, and those who, even to the present day, have succeeded Polycarp, who was a man of much greater authority, and a more faithful witness of the truth than Valentinus and Marcion, and the rest who hold their perverse opinions. For he was the man, who, when he came to Rome, in the time of Anicetus, converted many heretics from those of which I have already spoken, to the Church of God, declaring that he had received from the apostles that one and only system of truth which he delivered to the Church [1]."

Here is the passage with its context, showing the argument of Irenæus fully. And I beseech you, brethren, to have a little patience, until we can examine the testimony, and understand its real bearing.

The words on which you rely are those in which Ire-

[1] § 3. *Θεμελιώσαντες οὖν καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι ἀπόστολοι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, Λίνῳ τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχείρισαν· τούτου τοῦ Λίνου Παῦλος ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἐπιστολαῖς μέμνηται· διαδέχεται δὲ αὐτὸν Ἀνέγκλητος, μετὰ τοῦτον δὲ τρίτῳ τόπῳ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν κληροῦται Κλήμης, ὁ καὶ ἑωρακὼς τοὺς μακαρίους ἀποστόλους, καὶ συμβεβληκὼς αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔτι ἐναυλον τὸ κήρυγμα τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τὴν παράδοσιν πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἔχων, οὐ μόνος, ἔτι γὰρ πολλοὶ ὑπελείποντο τότε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων δεδιδαγμένοι· ἐπὶ τούτου οὖν τοῦ Κλήμεντος στάσεως οὐκ ὀλίγης τοῖς ἐν Κορίνθῳ γενομένης ἀδελφοῖς, ἐπέστειλεν ἡ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐκκλησία ἱκανωτάτην γραφὴν τοῖς Κορινθίοις, εἰς εἰρήνην συμβιβάζουσα αὐτοὺς, καὶ ἀνανεοῦσα τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἣν νεωστὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων παράδοσιν εἰλήφει——*

annuntiantem unum Deum omnipotentem, factorem cœli et terræ, plasmatorem hominis, qui induxerit cataclysmum, et advocaverit Abraham, qui eduxerit populum de terra Ægypti, qui colloquutus sit Moysi, qui legem disposuerit, et prophetas miserit, qui ignem præparaverit diabolo et angelis ejus. Hunc Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi ab Ecclesiis annuntiari, ex ipsa Scriptura, qui velint, discere possunt, et Apostolicam Ecclesiæ traditionem intelligere ; quum sit vetustior epistola his qui nunc falso docent, et alterum Deum super Demiurgum et factorem horum omnium, quæ sunt commentiuntur.

næus declares, that "*to the Church of Rome, by reason of the more powerful principality, it must needs be that the whole Church resort, that is, those who are faithful on every side; in which the tradition which is from the apostles has always been preserved.*" And these, you say, prove Irenæus to be a witness, that the pope then possessed supreme authority over the Christian world, and that the Church of Rome was acknowledged of right as the mother and mistress of all the Churches. But do the words of Irenæus authorize your conclusion? Does he not, in the first place, speak of all the apostles indifferently, and expressly declare that the tradition of the apostles was given to us "*in the Scriptures, to be the pillar and ground of our faith?*" Does he not make the establishment of the Church of Rome the joint act of both Peter and Paul, saying in positive terms that they set Linus over that

Τὸν δὲ Κλήμεντα τοῦτον διαδέχεται Εὐάρεστος, καὶ τὸν Εὐάρεστον Ἀλέξανδρος· εἶθ' οὕτως ἐκτὸς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καθίσταται Ξύστος· μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον Τελέσφορος, ὃς καὶ ἐνδόξως ἐμαρτύρησεν· ἔπειτα Ὑγῖνος, εἶτα Πῖος· μεθ' ὃν Ἀνίκητος· διαδεξαμένου τὸν Ἀνίκητον Σωτῆρος, νῦν δωδεκάτῳ τόπῳ τὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων κατέχει κλῆρον Ἐλεύθερος, τῇ αὐτῇ τάξει, καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ διαδοχῇ ἥτε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παράδοσις, καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας κήρυγμα κατήντηκεν εἰς ἡμᾶς.

§ 4. Καὶ Πολύκαρπος δὲ οὐ μόνον ἀπὸ ἀποστόλων μαθητευθεὶς, καὶ συναναστραφεὶς πολλοῖς τοῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἑωρακόσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπὸ ἀποστόλων κατασταθεὶς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν, ἐν τῇ ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἐπίσκοπος, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἑωράκαμεν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡλικίᾳ (ἐπιπολὺ γὰρ παρέμεινε, καὶ πάνυ γηραλέος, ἐνδόξως καὶ ἐπιφανέστατα μαρτυρήσας ἐξῆλθε τοῦ βίου) ταῦτα δίδαξας ἀεί, ἃ καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔμαθεν, ἃ καὶ ἡ ἐκκλησία παραδίδωσιν, ἃ καὶ μόνα ἐστιν ἀληθῆ. Μαρτυροῦσι τούτοις αἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐκκλησίαι πᾶσαι, καὶ οἱ μέχρι νῦν διαδεδεγμένοι τὸν Πολύκαρπον, πολλῷ ἀξιοπιστότερον καὶ βεβαιότερον ἀληθείας μάρτυρα ὄντα, Οὐαλεντίνου καὶ Μαρκίωνος, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν κακογνωμόνων· ὃς καὶ ἐπὶ Ἀνικήτου ἐπιδημήσας τῇ Ῥώμῃ, πολλοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν προειρημένων αἱρετικῶν ἐπέστρεψεν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, μίαν καὶ μόνην ταύτην ἀλήθειαν κηρύξας ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων παρειληφέναι, τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας παραδεδομένην. Iren. cont. Hær. Lib. 3. Cap. 3. p. 176.

Church as its bishop, and not intimating, in the slightest degree, that Peter ever established himself as bishop there, or as the Doway catechism states it, transferred his chair from Antioch to Rome? And with respect to the more powerful principality of which Irenæus speaks, he does not use one word which connects this principality with the Church, or with its bishop; but refers simply to its location in that city, which was then, and for many centuries before and after, the acknowledged mistress of the world. That on account of the more powerful principality of Rome, where was held the seat of the imperial government—where was the capitol, from which the decrees of the Roman senate went forth throughout the globe—in which were concentrated all the wealth, the learning, the ambition, the pleasures, and the interests of millions, and which was at once the head and the heart of that most mighty of empires, it must needs have been that the Church established there was regarded with peculiar interest by the minor Churches around it—that it was the richest, the most numerous, the most influential, and the most important Church in the general esteem of Christians, by reason of its peculiar location—all this I freely concede. Irenæus calls it by a term which is in the superlative, *most ancient*, or, otherwise, very ancient *(antiquissima)*. The first meaning cannot be the true one, because we all agree that Jerusalem, Antioch, and many other Churches, were prior to Rome in the order of time. But taking the other sense of this word for the meaning, I adopt most cheerfully the whole of his description, and agree that the Church of Rome was then rightly called the greatest, the very ancient, and the most universally known Church, to which, on account of the greater principality—you say of the Church, but I say of the city—all Christian Churches, everywhere round about, must of necessity resort. The distinction here granted, and

the necessary results of it, were equally suited to the argument of Irenæus, whether St. Peter had any connection with the establishment of that Church or not. It was purely secular, arising out of the advantages of its position; and our author does not use one word which attributes to it any other character.

I am not fond, brethren, of resting any religious question on mere verbal criticism; but the importance you attach to the passage before us, seems to require that I should examine it closely. The words of the original, as you know, are lost; and we are obliged to take for the original a very poor Latin version. Such as we have it, the passage stands thus: "*Ad hanc enim ecclesiam, propter potiorem principalitatem, necesse est*," &c., literally: "To this Church, on account of the more powerful principality, it must needs be," &c. The translator does not say: *proper potiorem principalitatem* EJUS, —*on account of* ITS *more powerful principality*,—but leaves out all connexion of the kind: which it is strange he should have done, if he designed to convey the meaning you attribute to him. Hence, I conceive myself strictly authorized to infer that such was not his intention: but that he referred to the principality of the city, and that he had no idea of the spiritual supremacy of ecclesiastical dominion, to which you would suppose him to bear testimony.

A little reflection upon the scope of Irenæus' argument will perhaps show this point more clearly. He had been employed in refuting the wild absurdities of the Gnostic heretics from the authority of Scripture, and now he desires to put them down by the authority of tradition. If these heretics were right, the apostles of Christ must have taught the same doctrine: and if the apostles had taught this doctrine, the bishops who succeeded them, and the Churches planted by them, must still hold the

same. To them, therefore, in the second place, Irenæus confidently appeals; and after confounding the heretics from Scripture, "We also confound them," says he, "by the succession of the bishops in the Churches which the apostles planted. But since it would be tedious," continues he, "to reckon the succession of all the Churches," let us refer to the greatest and best known of all, the Church planted in the chief city, the principality of the Roman empire. He then counts up the succession since the beginning, in the Church of Rome; and after this, turns to the testimony of the Church of Smyrna, and draws the same argument from the preaching of Polycarp, a celebrated martyr, and from all the Churches of Asia.

I am aware that there is an ambiguity in the word which I have translated, *resort*, which sometimes bears the sense, *consent;* and this latter sense you doubtless prefer, because it gives the whole a much more favourable meaning. You would probably, therefore, say, that "*To this Church*, by reason of the more powerful principality, it must needs be that the whole Church *consents*," would be a more correct translation: to which I have to object, that your version would not only strain the natural meaning of the words, but the idea conveyed by it would have no connexion with the argument. The testimony of the Church of Rome to the principles of the Gospel, was what Irenæus wanted to adduce against the Gnostics: and this testimony could have been in no wise affected by a point of episcopal supremacy. But he adduced this Church in preference, because it was the greatest, and the best known, in consequence of the concourse of all the faithful to the Church of the chief city of the empire; and therefore its testimony suited his purpose in arguing against heretics, for the plain reason, that it was the testimony of a more numerous, important, and distinguished body.

I am happy to find your learned Touttée, the translator of Cyril, concurring in this view, in his Appendix to the fifth Catechesis (p. 82), where, speaking of the Church in Jerusalem, he says, that "the concourse of all strangers from every part of the world, produced the same result as Irenæus had remarked of Rome, that novelties could not there increase against the force of tradition, since they would be more readily discovered and corrected[1]."

There is, however, another and a much more conclusive justification of the sense which I have attached to the word in question, derived from a fact related by Irenæus, and recorded by Eusebius, the ecclesiastical historian of the fourth century.

You know, brethren, that there was a controversy in the second century, between Victor, the bishop of Rome, and the Churches of Asia, about the time of keeping Easter: and the Eastern Churches refusing to change their custom for the sake of conforming to the practice of Rome, Victor undertook to excommunicate them. For this high-handed stretch of power, he was generally censured; and amongst the rest, Irenæus wrote him a letter of expostulation, of which the following is a part.

[2] "But those elders, who, before Soter, governed the

[1] "Concursum omnium ex toto orbe peregrinorum, simile quidquam effecisse, quod Irenæus Romæ factum observat, ne ibi facile posset novarum contra traditionem opinionum soboles increscere; citius enim deprehensa et correcta fuisset."

[2] Καὶ οἱ πρὸ Σωτῆρος πρεσβύτεροι οἱ προστάντες τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἧς νῦν ἀφηγῇ, Ἀνίκητον λέγομεν καὶ Πῖον, Ὑγῖνόν τε καὶ Τελέσφορον, καὶ Ξύστον, οὔτε αὐτοὶ ἐτήρησαν, οὔτε τοῖς μετ' αὐτοὺς ἐπέτρεπον, καὶ οὐδὲν ἧττον αὐτοὶ μὴ τηροῦντες, εἰρήνευον τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν παροικιῶν, ἐν αἷς ἐτηρεῖτο, ἐρχομένοις πρὸς αὐτούς.——Καὶ τοῦ μακαρίου Πολυκάρπου ἐπιδημήσαντος τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ Ἀνικήτου, καὶ περὶ ἄλλων τινῶν μικρὰ σχόντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους, εὐθὺς εἰρήνευσαν, περὶ τούτου τοῦ κεφαλαίου μὴ φιλεριστήσαντες ἑαυτούς· οὔτε γὰρ ὁ Ἀνίκητος τὸν Πολύκαρπον πεῖσαι ἐδύνατο μὴ τηρεῖν, ἅτε μετὰ Ἰωάννου τοῦ μαθητοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν,

Church over which you now preside," (*i. e.* the Church of Rome) "namely, Anicetus, and Pius, and Hyginus, with Telesphorus and Sixtus, neither observed this custom themselves, nor allowed those who were with them to observe it. Nevertheless, although they did not observe it, yet they preserved peace with those who came to them from these Churches in which it was observed."—"And when the blessed Polycarp came to Rome, in the time of Anicetus, and there was a little controversy between them about other things, they embraced each other presently with the kiss of peace, not greatly contending about this question. For neither could Anicetus ever persuade Polycarp to cease this thing, because he had lived familiarly with John, the disciple of our Lord, and with the other apostles, and observed their custom continually. Nor, on the other hand, could Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe it, since Anicetus said that he retained the custom of those elders who were before him. When matters were thus situated, they communed together; and Anicetus yielded to Polycarp, as a token of respect, the office of consecrating the eucharist in the Church; and at length they departed from each other in peace, as well those who observed this custom, as those who observed it not, keeping the peace of the whole Church."

Now, I beg you to observe this statement of Irenæus carefully, and you cannot fail to see that it is totally

καὶ λοιπῶν ἀποστόλων οἷς συνδιέτριψεν, ἀεὶ τετηρηκότα· οὔτε μὴν ὁ Πολύκαρπος τὸν Ἀνίκητον ἔπεισε τηρεῖν, λέγοντα τὴν συνήθειαν τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ πρεσβυτέρων ὀφείλειν κατέχειν· καὶ τούτων οὕτως ἐχόντων, ἐκοινώνησαν ἑαυτοῖς· καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παρεχώρησεν ὁ Ἀνίκητος τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τῷ Πολυκάρπῳ, κατ' ἐντροπὴν δηλονότι, καὶ μετ' εἰρήνης ἀπ' ἀλλήλων ἀπηλλάγησαν, πάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας εἰρήνην ἐχόντων καὶ τῶν μὴ τηρούντων. Fragmentum Epistolæ ad Victorem Papam Romanum, ex Euseb. lib. v. Histor. cap. 24. Iren. Op. p. 341.

irreconcilable with the sense which has sometimes been put upon the other passage, and that it fully justifies, nay, indeed, demands, the translation which I have given. For if Irenæus in that place intended to have said, that on account of the greater principality it was necessary that the whole Church should *agree* with the Church of Rome, how could he justify Polycarp in *differing* with that Church upon the time of keeping Easter? How could Anicetus be set forth as a worthy example for Victor, in giving the kiss of peace to the bishop of Smyrna, at the very time that he was obstinately refusing to conform to the supremacy of Rome? If, according to your doctrine, Rome was even then acknowledged as the mother and mistress of all the Churches—if her bishop, as your canon tells us, held by divine institution the place of God and of Christ upon the earth—tell me, I beseech you, how Polycarp, the scholar of St. John, and the companion of the other apostles, could be so ignorant of these mighty prerogatives as to hold a controversy with the then pope, and to maintain such absolute independence in a practice which his supposed superior condemned?

It is in vain that the force of this testimony is impugned, by considering the subject of the controversy as a trifle. It was no trifle, but a very serious question of ecclesiastical order. For you know, brethren, that then, as now, there was always a fast preceding the festival of Easter; that on the Friday before Easter the Church commemorated the last sufferings of her great Redeemer, and on the following Sunday threw off her mourning, and appeared in her utmost joy to honour his resurrection; and that the consequence of the discrepancy between the Eastern and Western Churches was, that this whole beautiful order was thrown into confusion. One part of the Church was sometimes fasting while another part was feasting. One part was mourning in sympathy with Christ's passion,

while another part was celebrating his resurrection with psalms of triumphant praise; and therefore, Christians from different Churches, who agreed sufficiently in all other things, could not even worship together with comfort during the most interesting portion of the whole ecclesiastical year. Hence it was a matter of considerable importance, and produced much warm discussion; but it could have produced none, if your present doctrine had been the doctrine of that day. Polycarp would have been taught by St. John to reverence the primacy of St. Peter and his successors, if any such thing had been contemplated in the original polity of the Christian commonwealth. Polycarp would have known that there was some other prince in the Church besides the Lord Jesus Christ, viz. his vicar on earth, representing his person, and holding the place of God, as your canon law expresses it. And he would have approached Anicetus, the bishop of Rome, not with the independent frankness of an equal in authority, but in the ready and suppliant temper which became his inferior station.

I ask you, then, this simple question, brethren: Was Polycarp right in maintaining this independence, or was he wrong? Anicetus, the bishop of Rome, acknowledged that he was right in his independence, though he differed with him in opinion and in practice; and therefore he gave him the kiss of peace, and desired him to exercise the honourable office of consecrating the eucharist. Irenæus plainly takes the same ground, and therefore maintains the liberty of the Eastern Church against Victor on the very same question in his own day. And will you still think that Irenæus regarded the pope of Rome as you regard him? Is not the difference between the fraternal and equal rights of the primitive bishops of Rome and Smyrna in the second century, and the most unequal rights of their successors in our time, great, even beyond the power of any common terms

of comparison? Try the experiment, I pray you: imagine any bishop of your Church, of equal rank with the bishop of Smyrna, to act as Polycarp acted; and conjecture, if you can, the reception he would meet with at the court of Rome: and then say, as men who love the truth, whether the system of your canon law has not an irreconcilable enemy rather than a friend, in the testimony of Irenæus.

CHAPTER X.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

AFTER examining the testimony of this most unimpeachable witness, suffer me to pause awhile before adducing any other, in order to present to you the general view which I believe the truth will be found to sanction. The language of Irenæus, I regard as furnishing a most satisfactory key to the whole mystery, with which the question is connected in the ordinary mind. For many centuries, Rome has been a city of splendid ruins, with no empire except that vast supremacy which is rested upon the supposed grant of the Almighty. I do not wonder, therefore, that the very fact of this supremacy existing so long without any apparent support from the temporal power, should strike your imaginations as being almost conclusive evidence in its favour: so that when you look at the real language of antiquity, you read it under the strong bias of a settled belief, which bends it in accordance with your system, without your being sensible of any violence to the rights of truth. But if you will take the assertion of your own witness for the foundation of the matter, I think you will be able to see how your present doctrine was likely to have obtained its growth by the operation of causes wholly secular. At least, my reflections have led me to this result; and I beg your indulgence for a little while, in order to state the course of those reflections, so as to account for the rise of this

doctrine, on the one hand; and avoid charging you with intentional tyranny or deception, on the other.

At the time when the apostles, Peter and Paul, established the Church in Rome, it was, as I have said, the capital city of the civilized world. On such a capital, perhaps, the sun never shone. It is saying much less than the truth to assert, that what Paris is to France, or London to England, Rome was to the world; because France and England know that there are other powers upon the earth independent of their respective governments; but the subjects of that empire city saw no power upon the earth independent of Rome. The ambassadors of every potentate came to do homage before the majesty of a single throne. Dissensions amongst nations were brought for settlement before the senate. Rival kings, contending for the same tributary diadem, submitted their claims to that august tribunal. The very name of Roman citizen was a protection and a privilege in every land, and an appeal to Rome was the final recourse of universal justice.

In our age, brethren, it is not easy—indeed it is hardly possible—to conceive aright of such a city. Divided as the nations have been ever since her decline and fall, and each government displaying but a fractional part of her whole dominion, it is hard for us to imagine the majesty, the force, the concentration, the harmony, the glory, the beauty, the overpowering splendour of the spectacle which ancient Rome, in the days of Augustus, displayed to the admiration of a subject world. To the moral sense, the picture was as sublime as it was beautiful. The whole earth in peaceful subordination to one man, and he content with the kind and moderate titles of general and father—the temple of Janus shut, and wars and commotions almost done away by the wise administration of supreme justice—the whole of the mighty empire bringing its treasure and its allegiance to the great centre, which

was its fountain-head of power, and enjoying in return the rich advantages of protection and government, the valour and the labour of its legions, its science, and its literature, which, like the nerves and life-blood of the natural body, were diffused freely to the remotest extremities—all this displayed a picture of human unity, on which, in its theory, the philanthropist and the philosopher might well gaze with delight; nor can I imagine how, with such a picture before them, the minds of the best of men at that day could help being strongly affected.

About the time when the last touch of perfection had been given to this wonderful empire, Christianity arose, and a Church was established in the imperial city. In wealth, in numbers, in importance, it is obvious that it must soon have surpassed all others. Every thing in the chief city of an ordinary kingdom acquires a kind of practical supremacy over the whole of that territory. The professions, the trades, the fashions, the literature, the amusements of the capital, give a sort of law to the rest by a perfectly familiar principle of deference, which is acknowledged and understood by all men. What must have been the strength of that principle in regard to imperial Rome!

But perhaps it may not be useless,—inasmuch as the mind is often aided in its reflections on the force of circumstances by transferring them to some familiar object of our own day,—if I try to illustrate my idea of a secular supremacy by a simple analogy.

Let us suppose, then, that we had sent a number of missionaries to plant the Gospel in China, who had succeeded in establishing Churches in several of the provinces of that extensive country. In the progress of their labours we are informed that a Church is gathered in the capital itself. The emperor, the powerful mandarins, the officers of government, the men of influence, are now likely to be

brought under the blessed yoke of the Gospel. Is it not reasonable that we should attach tenfold more importance to that Church than to the provincial Churches—that for its support we should be most anxious—that into its progress we should most fondly inquire, and that we should expect, nay advise, all the other missionaries through the nation to be most solicitous for its welfare, and most ready to make its advancement the primary object of their prayers and toils?

If, however, such would be our views, at a distance from the field of action, how much more would the same principle of expediency operate on the missionaries themselves? Of what vast importance would they esteem the progress of truth in the capital of the Chinese empire? How surely would they calculate that success *there*, was, in fact, success everywhere? How thankfully would they count the numbers of converts from the ranks of the influential and the great, not because their souls were of more value, but because the conversion of such as these was the readiest mode of breaking down the kingdom of darkness, and inducing multitudes to examine, with favourable dispositions, the system of truth; and how manifest it is, that in such a case the missionaries, settled in the provincial Churches, would readily grant a primacy of influence and consequence to their brethren in the capital city, which would make them the chief leaders, advisers, and, in fine, directors of the whole? And yet, in all this, we see at a glance that it is simply to be resolved into the importance of the local situation, that it has no connection whatever with the spiritual rank or ecclesiastical dignity of the missionaries themselves, but is purely the result of judicious views of practical expediency.

Now, then, if we were called to draw up a code of regulations for a body of missionaries thus circumstanced, should we not, perhaps, think it proper to advise all due

regard to these principles? Should we not say, Be careful about union, and in all your proceedings consult together; but especially do nothing without consulting with your brethren of the capital city. In order that the good cause should prosper, it is necessary that you should resort to the Church established there, as often as you can: by reason of its more powerful principality, being the seat of government and the very heart of the empire, the Church located there is the most important of the whole, and the brethren placed over it should have the chief direction in all your councils. Would not such advice as this be deemed prudent and wise by all men? And hence, is it not plain that we could go farther than Irenæus has done in support of a primacy, without departing in the least from the ground of secular superiority, derived simply from the importance of the location?

But in the situation of the Christian Church, as planted in ancient Rome, there was much more than any modern analogy can furnish, to contribute to the same result. During seasons of persecution, when heathen rage was excited against the faithful, *The Christians to the lions* was the first cry, and the Church in Rome was usually called upon to take the lead in the glory of martyrdom. In times of peace, the crowds of philosophers and disputers which thronged the imperial city, drew out the best talents and strongest energies of the priesthood in the defence of truth. And the influx of strangers, the applications for aid, and the calls on liberality, which were sure to be most abundant where there was most inducement to attract them, would keep the sympathies, the hospitality, and the beneficence of that Church in the fullest action. Add to all this, that if the Christians in the provinces needed any indulgence from the government, their requests could be best presented through the brethren at Rome; that the bishop of Rome was on the very spot where he had the

best opportunity of appeasing the imperial wrath, or conciliating the imperial favour; that when the clergy or others had occasion to travel, his letters would have the greatest weight by reason of his local superiority; that when any of the prætors or provincial magistrates was likely to prove hostile to the Christian cause, the bishop of Rome was the only man who could hope to have influence sufficient with the officers of the court to have him counteracted or recalled; that writers on the Christian religion would first seek patronage and praise from the same dignitary, and that all who thought themselves aggrieved throughout the rest of the Church, would naturally endeavour to strengthen their cause by the sentence of his approbation—all this, brethren, and much more of the same character, suggests itself to a mind of common reflection, in tracing the various causes of the secular primacy obtained by that Church, which was established near the throne of the Cæsars, in the empire city of the world.

The last feature of the case presents the influence which these circumstances must have exerted on the minds of the Roman clergy themselves, when connected with the important fact, that the secular empire of Rome was one mighty whole—the earth under one head—the world under a single prince, and that prince called a father. Dull and stupid must the intellect have been, that could fail to discover the application of this idea to the Christian Church; for was it not, in truth, one kingdom under a single King—one family under a Father? And why not give the benefit of this consolidation to the Hierarchy on earth? Why not secure to the whole Church that order and subordination and peace under a single earthly head, as the Lord's Vicegerent, which heathenism had brought, in the affairs of human government, to such a marvellous system? Should the

hosts of Satan be better marshalled than the hosts of God? Should one single will be felt and obeyed to the remotest bounds of that mighty empire, and should not one single Church, which is the spouse of Christ, be much rather the ruler and mistress through the whole of Christendom? On such a plan, how much more union might be expected, how much more peace, how much less opportunity for heresy and false doctrine; and how much more glorious would be the victory of the Lord's people, when they should appear to the heathen one mighty host, "bright as the sun, fair as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners."

Brethren, I can easily conceive that the best men of the primitive ages, being accustomed to have this astonishing empire of the world continually before their eyes, and to hear it as the common and favourite theme of the orators, and courtiers, and civilians, and soldiers, and travellers around them, might readily, in this manner, be led to contemplate the desirableness and practicability of a similar system in the Church, and to cherish and encourage every advantage they possessed for its perfect consummation, as providential instruments placed in their hands by divine wisdom, for this especial purpose. I can easily conceive, that under this influence of their habitual views, they would find, in Scripture, analogies, and even declarations, which—had not the idea of universal empire been first rendered familiar by the political state of the world—would never have occurred to them. That thus disposed, they would derive a supposed parallel in principle from the high priest of ancient Israel, and instead of applying it to the single district of a bishop, would apply it to the whole of Christendom—that they would lay hold on our Lord's addresses to Peter (the only passages in the New Testament which ingenuity itself could put into the semblance of divine authority,) and

begin to interpret them in favour of their ecclesiastical empire,—that all who were connected with Rome, who had obligations to the Church there, who feared their censure or loved their praise, or who had any thing to expect from their influence, would readily adopt the system; and that the converts amongst the great and noble, who had been accustomed to the maxim that Rome was the mistress of the world, would be prompt and zealous in defence of an idea which harmonized so well with their own political and patriotic feelings—all this I can conceive, most readily, as easily accounting for the rise and progress of a secular primacy, without calling it by any harsh or offensive name. I do not, therefore, look upon your doctrine as having its *origin* in tyranny, in fraud, or in a desire to lord it over mankind. Its beginning, I think, I have traced to a much better set of principles. And as I hold myself bound in all cases to look for the most favourable motives and causes of human action—for otherwise how can I judge as I would be judged?—so I attribute to the policy of the primitive Church of Rome, nothing more than can be fully explained by the favourable influence of their location, their habits of dwelling on the theory and practice of universal empire, and their desire to secure the unity and peace of the Church; on the supposition that they were—what I willingly esteem them to have been—holy and well-meaning men.

The difference between the local primacy and that which you now assert, will be shown distinctly before I conclude. I shall only, for the present, observe, that the one was secular, the other is spiritual; the one was human, the other is divine; the one interfered with the liberty of no other Church, the other claims authority over the whole. The one grew out of the political pre-eminence of ancient Rome, and should now be yielded, of

right, in their respective proportions, to the other cities which, in the order of Providence, have attained a far larger measure of influence over the affairs of men; but the other insists on the fiat of the Almighty, superior to all earthly mutation, that Rome shall be the mother and the mistress of the Christian world to the end of time. And this divine supremacy, you call on all to believe, *at the peril of their salvation!* How badly your present doctrine accords with the evidence of antiquity, I have already shown in part; and I shall now resume the examination of your witnesses, from whose testimony it will be sufficiently apparent, that many centuries elapsed before the establishment of your exclusive claims.

CHAPTER XI.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

OUR next witness in order of time, is the famous Tertullian, that extraordinary writer, whom Cyprian—himself a burning and shining light—was accustomed to call his master.

In this writer's account of the establishment of the Church, we have the following strong passage:

[1] "About to return to his Father, after his resurrection, he (sc. Christ) ordered the eleven to go and teach the nations, baptizing them in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost. Immediately, therefore, the apostles (whom this appellation styles messengers) a twelfth named Matthias, being chosen by lot in the place of Judas, by the authority of the prophecy in the Psalm of David, having attained the power promised by the Holy Spirit of tongues and other virtues, first throughout Judea, bore testimony to the faith of Jesus Christ, and established Churches; and thence going out into the world,

[1] Reliquos undecim digrediens ad Patrem post resurrectionem, jussit ire et docere nationes, intinguendas in Patrem, et in Filium, et in Spiritum Sanctum. Statim igitur Apostoli (quos hæc appellatio missos interpretatur) assumpto per sortem duodecimo Matthia in locum Judæ, ex auctoritate prophetiæ, quæ est in psalmo David, consecuti promissam vim Spiritus Sancti ad virtutes et eloquium, primo per Judæam contestata fide in Jesum Christum, et Ecclesiis institutis; dehinc in orbem profecti, eandem doctrinam ejusdem fidei nationibus promulgaverunt, et proinde

promulgated the same doctrine of the faith among the nations, and established Churches in each city; from which the other Churches thenceforward borrowed the graff of faith and the seeds of doctrine, and daily borrow as new Churches are formed. And on this account they are considered apostolic, as being the progeny of the apostolical Church. For every race must needs be esteemed according to its origin. Therefore, though there are so many and various Churches, there is but one first from the apostles, from which are all. Thus all are first and apostolical, for all being one proves unity: while there is the communion of peace, and the name of brotherhood, and the pledge of hospitality, which rights are governed by no other rule than the one tradition of the same mystery."——"If these things are so, it results, that thenceforward every doctrine which accords with those apostolic Churches, the wombs and originals of faith, should be reputed for truth: and that is without doubt to be holden, which the Churches received from the apostles, the apostles from Christ, and Christ from God: but every doctrine is to be prejudged of falsehood which pretends to be wise against the truth of the Churches, and of the apostles,

Ecclesias apud unamquamque civitatem condiderunt, a quibus traducem fidei et semina doctrinæ, ceteræ exinde Ecclesiæ mutuatæ sunt, et quotidie mutuantur ut Ecclesiæ fiant. Ac per hoc et ipsæ Apostolicæ deputantur, ut soboles Apostolicarum Ecclesiarum. Omne genus ad originem suam censeatur necesse est. Itaque tot ac tantæ Ecclesiæ, una est illa ab Apostolis prima, ex qua omnes. Sic omnes primæ et Apostolicæ dum una omnes probant unitatem: dum est illis communicatio pacis, et appellatio fraternitatis, et contesseratio hospitalitatis, quæ jura non alia ratio regit, quam ejusdem sacramenti una traditio.——Si hæc ita sunt, constat proinde omnem doctrinam, quæ cum illis Ecclesiis Apostolicis, matricibus et originalibus fidei, conspiret, veritati deputandam; sine dubio tenentem quod Ecclesiæ ab Apostolis, Apostoli a Christo, Christus a Deo accepit: omnem verò doctrinam de mendacio præjudicandam, quæ sapiat contra veritatem Ecclesiarum, et Apostolorum, et Christi, et Dei."——"Solent dicere, Non omnia Apostolos scisse, eadem agitati dementia qua rursus

and of Christ, and of God."——"But some of these heretics say, the apostles did not know all things; and others, moved by the same madness, say that the apostles truly knew all things, but they did not deliver all things to all; in both subjecting Christ to censure, as sending forth for apostles, persons deficient in knowledge, or in integrity. But what man of sound mind can believe that they were ignorant, whom the Lord gave us for teachers, having them individually in his companionship, in his tuition, at his table; to whom, whatever obscure matters he put forth to others, he explained, saying that to them it was given to know mysteries, which it was not lawful for the people to understand? Was any thing hidden from Peter, who was called the rock of the Church to be erected, having obtained the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the power of loosing and binding in heaven and on earth? Was any thing hidden from John, the most beloved of the Lord, lying on his breast, to whom alone our Lord shewed beforehand the traitor Judas, and whom he asked to be the son of Mary in his place? What did he desire them not to know, to whom he even exhibited his glory, with Moses and Elias, and the voice of his Father from heaven?"

convertunt, Omnia quidem Apostolos scisse, sed non omnia omnibus tradidisse, in utroque Christum reprehensioni subjicientes, qui aut minus instructos, aut parum simplices Apostolos miserit. Quis igitur integræ mentis credere potest aliquid eos ignorasse, quos magistros Dominus dedit, individuos habens in comitatu, in discipulatu, in convictu; quibus obscura quæque seorsum disserebat, illis dicens datum esse cognoscere arcana, quæ populo intelligere non liceret? Latuit aliquid Petrum ædificandæ Ecclesiæ petram dictum, claves regni cœlorum consecutum, et solvendi et alligandi in cœlis et in terris potestatem? Latuit et Joannem aliquid, dilectissimum Domino, pectori ejus incubantem, cui soli Dominus Judam traditorem præmonstravit, quem loco suo filium Mariæ demandavit? Quid eos ignorasse voluit, quibus etiam gloriam suam exhibuit, et Moysen et Heliam, et insuper de cœlo Patris vocem?" Tert. de Præscrip. Hæret. § xx. xxi. xxii. pp. 208, 9.

Now here we find Tertullian, only one century after the death of the apostle John, giving an account of the planting of the Church, speaking of its unity, and insisting strongly on the argument of prescription and tradition with the heretics, as Irenæus had done before him; without the slightest allusion to the Church of Rome, or the superiority of one apostle over the others, or the primacy for the successors of St. Peter, which you claim for the pope at the present day. True it is, indeed, that Tertullian seems to authorize your interpretation of the passages of Scripture, which speak of Peter's being a rock, and the keys of the kingdom of heaven being given to him. But since it is a rule of universal application that every author shall explain his own meaning, I shall turn to Tertullian himself, in order to shew you, that he did not use these expressions in the sense which you affix to them, but in one which you utterly disclaim.

Speaking on the very point of the privileges which our Lord granted to Peter, and the powers which the Church derived from him, Tertullian uses the following strong language.

[1] "But now from your own argument I would know, from whence you usurp this right for the Church? If from our Lord's saying to Peter, Upon this rock I will build my Church, To thee I have given the keys of the kingdom of heaven, or, Whatsoever thou shalt bind or loose on earth shall be bound or loosed in heaven; dost thou therefore presume this power of loosing and binding to have descended to thee, that is, to the whole Church

[1] De tua nunc sententia quæro, unde hoc jus Ecclesiæ usurpes? Si quia dixerit Petro Dominus, Super hanc petram ædificabo ecclesiam meam, Tibi dedi claves regni cœlestis, vel, Quæcumque alligaveris vel solveris in terra, erunt alligata vel soluta in cœlis; idcirco præsumis et ad te derivasse solvendi et alligandi potestatem, id est ad omnem ecclesiam Petri propinquam, qualis es evertens atque commutans manifestam

which is related to Peter? Who art thou, thus overturning and changing the manifest intention of our Lord, who conferred this on Peter personally. Upon *thee*, he says, I will build my Church; and, To *thee* I will give the keys, not to the Church; and, Whatsoever *thou* shalt loose or bind, not whatsoever they shall loose or bind. So likewise the event teaches. On him the Church was built, that is, through him, he furnished the key; behold what key; Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man destined for you by God," and so on. He too, first, in the baptism of Christ, unlocked the gate of the celestial kingdom, by which the offences which were formerly bound are loosed, and those things which might not be loosed are bound, according to the true salvation: and he bound Ananias with the chain of death, and he loosed the impotent man from his lameness. Likewise in that disputation; whether the law was to be kept or not, Peter, the first of all, filled with the Spirit, and having spoken before of the calling of the nations, saith, And now why do ye tempt the Lord by placing a yoke upon the brethren, which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear. But by the grace of Jesus we believe

Domini intentionem personaliter hoc Petro conferentem, Super te, inquit, ædificabo ecclesiam meam, et, Dabo tibi claves, non Ecclesiæ, et, Quæcumque solveris vel alligaveris, non quæ solverint vel alligaverint? Sic enim et exitus docet. In ipso Ecclesia exstructa est, id est per ipsum, ipse clavem imbuit; vide quam; Viri Israelitæ, auribus mandate quæ dico; Jesum Nazarenum virum a Deo vobis destinatum, et reliqua. Ipse denique primus in Christi baptismo reseravit aditum cœlestis regni, quo solvuntur alligata retro delicta, et alligantur quæ non fuerint soluta, secundum veram salutem; et Ananiam vinxit vinculo mortis, et debilem pedibus absolvit vitio valetudinis. Sed et in illa disceptatione custodiendæ necne legis, primus omnium Petrus Spiritu instinctus, et de nationum vocatione præfatus, Et nunc, inquit, cur tentastis Dominum de imponendo jugo fratribus quod neque nos, neque patres nostri sufferre valuerunt? Sed enim per gratiam Jesu credimus nos salutem consecuturos sicut et illi. Hæc sententia et solvit quæ omissa sunt legis, et alligavit

that we shall obtain salvation, even as they. This opinion both loosed the things of the law which were omitted, and bound those which were retained. So that the power of loosing and binding conferred on Peter has nothing to do with the mortal sins of believers. For to him the Lord had commanded forgiveness of his brother even if he had sinned against him seventy times seven; and surely he would not afterwards have commanded him to bind sins, that is, to retain them; unless perhaps those which any one might have committed, not against his brother, but against the Lord. For the very command given to forgive offences committed against man, seems to imply that no authority was intended to forgive sins against God. What now has all this to do with the Church, and especially with thine, thou carnal man? For according to the person of Peter, this power will suit spiritual men, such as an apostle or a prophet. Since the Church properly and principally is that spirit in whom is the Trinity of one divinity, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. He gathers that Church, which the Lord has placed in three. And therefore, from that time, every such number who unite in this faith, is

quæ reservata sunt. Adeo nihil ad delicta fidelium capitalia potestas solvendi et alligandi Petro emancipata. Cui si præceperat Dominus etiam septuagies septies delinquenti in eum fratri indulgere; utique, nihil postea alligare, id est, retinere mandasset, nisi forte ea quæ in Dominum, non in fratrem quis admiserit. Præjudicatur enim non dimittenda in Deum delicta, quum in homine admissa donantur. Quid nunc et ad Ecclesiam, et quidem tuam, Psychice? Secundum enim Petri personam Spiritalibus potestas ista conveniet, aut Apostolo, aut Prophetæ. Nam et Ecclesia proprie et principaliter ipse est Spiritus in quo est trinitas unius divinitatis Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus. Illam Ecclesiam congregat, quam Dominus in tribus posuit. Atque ita exinde etiam numerus omnis qui in hanc fidem conspiraverint, Ecclesia ab auctore et consecratore censetur. Et ideo Ecclesia quidem delicta donabit, sed Ecclesia spiritus per spiritualem hominem, non Ecclesia numerus episcoporum. Domini enim, non famuli est jus et arbitrium; Dei ipsius, non sacerdotis." Tertul. de Pud. § xxi. xxii. p. 574.

esteemed a Church by its Author and Consecrator. And thus indeed the Church will forgive offences, but this is the Church of the Spirit by the spiritual man, not the Church which is the number of bishops. For this is the prerogative and will of the master, not of the servant; of God himself, and not of the priest."

You will doubtless say, that this interesting passage is a part of Tertullian's work after he had become a follower of Montanus. It is so; but I do not see any reason for discarding it on this account, when used as a commentary on his own meaning in another part of his writings, and on the subject now before us. For not only had the errors of Montanus no relation to the doctrine of St. Peter's pastoral authority over the other apostles, and the derivation of that authority to the particular Church of Rome; but I shall presently show that some of your own critics defend Tertullian from having had any participation in them, since Montanus himself was orthodox at first, and became heretical afterwards. At all events, Tertullian was not called heretic in his own day; and as you acknowledge him to have been a man of the most austere and pious life, eminent for learning and genius, bold, fervent, and sincere, the especial favourite of St. Cyprian, and worthy to be held in reverence by yourselves to the present hour, he is surely an unimpeachable witness to prove that the spiritual supremacy of the Church of Rome was not the doctrine of his age even in the Church of Rome itself.

There are a few other passages from the same author, which I may, perhaps, do well to add, for your greater satisfaction.

Although he admits the application of the term *rock* to Peter, in which we shall find that he differs from the other fathers, yet he appropriates the name to Christ in chief. Thus, speaking of the circumcision of the Jews

with a knife of stone, he explains it to refer to the precepts of Christ, "for Christ," saith he, "was preached as the rock, under many modes and figures [1]."

There is also a place in his fourth book against Marcion, where he seems to account for Simon's name being changed to Peter, in a manner very different from what your doctrine would require [2]. "Christ changes the name from Simon to Peter," saith he, "because the Creator reformed also the names of Abraham, and Sarah, and Joshua, calling this last Jesus, by adding to them syllables. But why Peter? If on account of the vigour of his faith, there are many and solid arguments which would accommodate this name to him. Or whether was it because Christ was a rock and a stone? Since we read that he was placed as a stone of offence and a rock of scandal. I omit other matters." And here, accordingly, Tertullian leaves the question, without seeming at all conscious that Peter could be called a rock by reason of the whole Church, apostles and all, as your Doway Catechism assures us, being built upon him.

His reference to the Church as consisting of three, in allusion to the Trinity, he explains more fully in the following passage: "Are not we laymen priests also? It is written, He has made us a kingdom and priests to God and his Father. The authority of the Church has established the difference between the clergy and the laity,

[1] "Circumcisis nobis petrina acie; id est, Christi præceptis, petra enim Christus multis modis et figuris prædicatus est." Tertul. adv. Jud. § ix. p. 194. A.

[2] "Mutat et Petro nomen de Simone, quia et Creator Abrahæ et Saræ, et Auseæ nomina reformavit, hunc vocando Jesum, illis syllabas adjiciendo. Sed et cur Petrum? Si ob vigorem fidei, multæ materiæ solidæque nomen de suo accommodarent. An quia et petra et lapis Christus? Siquidem et legimus positum eum in lapidem offendiculi, et in petram scandali. Omitto cetera." Tertul. Adv. Marcion. lib. iv. § xiii. p. 425.

and this honour is sanctified by the council of the clergy; but wherever there is no council of the ecclesiastical order, thou offerest, and thou baptizest, and thou art a priest alone. But where there are three, the Church is, although they be laymen. For every one lives by his own faith [1]."

The phrase, "keys of the kingdom of heaven," which is manifestly a figure, is explained in a somewhat different manner by Tertullian, in different parts of his works. Thus, in one passage he says, "What key had the doctors of the law, but the interpretation of the law," where he presents an idea similar to that we have quoted already [2]. But in another place he says: "If thou dost still think that heaven is closed against thee, remember that the Lord gave the keys of it here to Peter, and through him, he left them to the Church, which keys every one here, being interrogated and making a good confession, shall carry with him [3]." Here again we have an interesting variety in the idea, but one which is by no means suited to your doctrine.

There is another passage of this author, often cited, in which he mentions the principal Churches, advising the heretics to apply to those which were of apostolic planting [4]. "Come then," saith he, "you who wish to exer-

[1] "Nonne et laïci sacerdotes sumus? Scriptum est, Regnum quoque nos et sacerdotes Deo et Patri suo fecit. Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit Ecclesiæ auctoritas, et honor per ordinis consessum sanctificatus, adeo ubi ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus, et offers, et tinguis, et sacerdos es solus. Sed ubi tres, Ecclesia est, licet laïci. Unusquisque enim sua fide vivit." Tertul. de Exhort. Castit. § vii. p. 522.

[2] "Quam vero clavem habebant legis doctores, nisi interpretationem legis?" Tertul. Adv. Marcion. lib. iv. § 27, p. 444.

[3] "Nam etsi adhuc clausum putas cœlum, memento claves ejus hic Dominum Petro, et per eum Ecclesiæ reliquisse, quas hic unusquisque interrogatus atque confessus feret secum." Tertul. Scorp. § x. p. 496. A.

[4] "Age jam qui voles curiositatem melius exercere in negotio salutis tuæ, percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ Apos-

cise your curiosity better in the concerns of your salvation, go through the apostolic Churches, amongst which the very seats of the apostles continue in their places, and their original epistles are recited, sounding forth the voice, and representing the countenance of each one. Is Achaia near to you? You have Corinth. If you are not far from Macedonia, you have Philippi, you have Thessalonica. If you cannot go throughout Asia, you have Ephesus. But if you are convenient to Italy, you have Rome, whence authority for us is nigh at hand. How happy is this Church to which the apostles gave their whole doctrine with their blood: where Peter was made equal to the sufferings of his Lord: where Paul was crowned (with martyrdom) at the going forth of John: where the apostle John was afterwards plunged into boiling oil, and suffering nothing, was banished to an island. Let us see too, what one might learn, what he might teach, when he should also have compared his symbol with the Churches of Africa. He acknowledges one God the Creator of the universe, and Jesus Christ, from the virgin Mary, the Son of God the Creator, and the resurrection of the flesh; he mingles the law and the prophets with the gospels and the epistles, and thence he

tolorum suis locis præsident, apud quas ipsæ authenticæ literæ eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem, et repræsentantes faciem uniuscujusque. Proxima est tibi Achaia? Habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedonia, habes Philippos, habes Thessalonienses. Si non potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiæ adjaces, Romam, unde nobis quoque authoritas præsto est. Ista quam felix Ecclesia; cui totam doctrinam Apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt: ubi Petrus passioni dominicæ adæquatur: ubi Paulus Joannis exitu coronatur: ubi Apostolus Joannes posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus, nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur. Videamus quid didicerit, quid docuerit, cum Africanis quoque Ecclesiis contesseravit. Unum Deum novit, creatorem universitatis, et Christum Jesum ex virgine Maria Filium Dei creatoris, et carnis resurrectionem; legem et prophetas cum evangelicis et apostolicis literis miscet, et inde potat fidem: eam aqua signat, Sancto Spiritu vestit,

drinks his faith; water signs it; it is clothed with the Holy Spirit; the eucharist nourishes it; martyrdom exhorts it, and thus, against this institution he receives no one. This is the institution which not only premonished men that there would be heresies, but from which heresies have gone away." Here is a beautiful passage, shewing an admiration of the Church of Rome on the part of Tertullian, and certainly displaying every disposition to do justice to her claims; yet there is not one word about the chair of Peter,—of the bishop of Rome holding the place of God and Christ upon the earth, —of Rome being the mother and mistress of the other dioceses, nor indeed, any thing that looks like her having a superior authority.

But it is time that this witness should be dismissed, for there are many others to be examined. Before I close his testimony, however, let me present to you, according to my promise, the opinion of one of yourselves, the learned and candid Rigault, on the subject of the aspersions, which those who relished not his honesty have endeavoured to cast upon him.

"[1] Those things which are called the heresies of Tertullian," saith this ingenuous critic, "hardly ordered any thing to be observed, except braver martyrdoms, severer fasts, more holy chastity, namely one marriage or none at all, in which things, however he may have sinned, he seems to have sinned through a more absolute and vehe-

eucharistia pascit, martyrium exhortatur, et ita adversus hanc institutionem neminem recipit. Hæc est institutio, non dico jam quæ futuras hæreses prænuntiabat, sed de qua hæreses prodierunt." Tertul. de Præscrip. Hæret. § xxxvi. p. 215.

[1] "Hæreses Tertulliani quæ dicuntur, ea vix aliud præcipiebant quam martyria fortiora, jejunia sicciora, castimonium sanctiorem, nuptias scilicet unas, aut nullas; in quibus quidquid peccavit, id omne virtutis amore vehementiore peccasse videatur. Illud certe gravius, quod Montani Paracletum agnovit atque defendit. Sed Montani schola, sicut et

ment love of virtue. This indeed appears a graver accusation, that he acknowledged and defended the Paraclete of Montanus. But the school of Montanus, as Baronius himself observes, stood for a long while innocent; and his disciples were so commendable for the sanctity of their manners, venerable for their beneficent faculty of miracles, and strong in the constancy with which they endured martyrdom, that no one could recognize elsewhere, a more manifest power of the Deity." The conclusion of Rigault from these and other facts which may be omitted, is the conclusion, I doubt not, of truth; that Tertullian's adherence to Montanus must have been at the beginning of his course, when Montanus was applauded by the more austere for his extraordinary zeal; and not towards the end, when his orthodoxy became infected, and he sunk into contempt[1].

I conclude this chapter, brethren, by reminding you of Tertullian's maxim, which is a favourite one with yourselves, that "What is first is true, and what is subsequent is adulterated[2]." May you be enabled to apply it aright, and then you will have no difficulty in acknowledging that the spiritual dominion which you now claim over the Christian world, was not a doctrine of the primitive church of Rome, but one which sprung up at a much later day[3].

Baronius observat, aliquamdiu stetit innoxia, discipulos habuit adeo morum sanctitate commendabiles, beneficia miraculorum potentia reverendos, martyriorum constantia fortes, ut nemo præsentiores alibi Numinis vires agnosceret." Rigault in not. Tertul. op. p. 501.

[1] "Unde verosimile fiat, Montani dogma quale extitit, primordio quidem sui Christianis austerioribus probabili, Tertullianum tenuisse, non quale postea, cum sequacium quorumdam imposturis et fraudibus, acu Phrygia interpolatum, ab Ecclesiis Catholicis despui cœpit." Ibid.

[2] "Id esse verum quodcumque primum, id esse adulterum quodcumque posterius." Tertul. adv. Prax. § ii. p. 501.

[3] I have been somewhat surprised at a remark published by the learned author of the Difficulties of Romanism, (p. 261 of the American edition,

in the note,) where he says, that "in the time of Tertullian a considerable advance had been made by the See of Rome in the claim of the primacy, inasmuch as he (Tertullian) calls the bishop of that church the supreme pontiff, and distinguishes him with the authoritative title of bishop of bishops." This concession is gladly used, I perceive, in the book of the bishop of Strasburgh, published in answer to Mr. Faber; but I must beg leave to doubt whether either of those learned writers has understood Tertullian fairly. The passage is taken from his book De Pudicitia, and occupies its first page. I quote it with its context, in justice to the argument, and leave it to your candour to say whether he does not apply these titles rather in sarcasm than in sober allowance. "I hear," says Tertullian, "that an edict is proposed, and truly a peremptory one. The highest pontiff, the bishop of bishops, declares: I remit the sins of fornication and adultery, to all who have completed their penitence. O edict, which cannot be called a good deed. And where is this liberality displayed? There, as I think, on the very gates of lust, under the very titles of lust. There this kind of penitence is to be promulgated, where iniquity itself shall be most familiar. There pardon is to be read, whenever one shall enter with the hope of it. But this is read in the Church, and is uttered in the Church, and yet she is a virgin. Away, away with such preaching from the spouse of Christ. That Church which is true, which is modest, which is holy, should not have such uncleanness offered even to her ears."

To my mind the character of this whole passage shows that Tertullian had no idea of doing honour to the bishop of Rome, but the contrary. He calls him *pontifex maximus*, which was the title of the heathen high priest, and never seriously applied to the Christian priesthood until a much later age. And the other phrase, bishop of bishops, does not appear to have been either claimed or appropriated in favour of the bishop of Rome for many centuries after Tertullian's day. But even if these titles had been applied in the sobriety of historical narration, still they would not sustain your doctrine; for every metropolitan bishop who had bishops under him might as well be called a chief pontiff, and a bishop of bishops, as the bishop of Rome; and the supremacy by divine right of any one bishop over the whole Church, could, therefore, by no fair reasoning, be supported from such titles merely, since they might be given to others with the same propriety. That Tertullian could not have designed to concede any thing in favour of your present doctrine is incontestably plain from this single consideration; that the passage occurs in the opening of the same book from which I have quoted the extract on pages 85 and 86, so utterly hostile to your whole system. I add the original in full.

"Audio etiam edictum esse propositum, et quidem peremptorium, Pontifex scilicet maximus, quod est, Episcopus Episcoporum, edicit: Ego et mœchiæ et fornicationis delicta, pœnitentia functis dimitto. O edictum, cui adscribi non poterit, Bonum factum! Et ubi proponetur liberalitas

ista ? Ibidem, opinor, in ipsis libidinum januis, sub ipsis libidinum titulis. Illic ejusmodi pœnitentia promulganda est, ubi delinquentia ipsa versabitur. Illic legenda est venia, quo cum spe ejus intrabitur. Sed hoc in Ecclesia legitur, et in Ecclesia pronuntiatur, et virgo est. Absit, absit a sponsa Christi tale præconium. Illa quæ vera est, quæ pudica, quæ sancta, carebit etiam aurium maculis."

CHAPTER XII.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

ABOUT the same time with Tertullian, though as some think, rather earlier, flourished Clement of Alexandria, whose eulogium I have already quoted from Jerome, and whose name appears in your own canon law, among the "blessed."

The testimony of this eminent writer with respect to the supremacy of the Church of Rome, is purely negative, and yet, to a candid mind decisive. He mentions the Church, times without number, speaks of her unity, particularises the leading heresies, takes notice of the "keys," remarks on the preaching and acts of Peter, and yet never, by the slightest allusion, leads the reader to think that the Church was founded on Peter, that he had any authority over the other apostles, that this authority was transferred to the Roman bishops, or that any one Church held a power of government over the rest. The kind of evidence here furnished, cannot be exhibited by extracts. But the inference is irresistible, that had the doctrine of Rome been then received as it is now, no writer of intelligence, travelling over the extensive field which the works of Clement cover, could have avoided a plain statement of the fact; or at least, some intelligible allusions to it.

I add a few passages from this celebrated author, as a

specimen of the whole. "[1] To believe and to be regenerate, is perfection in life. There is no weakness with God. For as his will is work, and this is named the world, so his will is the salvation of men, and this is called the Church. He knew therefore those whom he called, and saved them, for he called and saved together."

"[2] But demonstration being required, it is necessary to descend to controversial questions, and to learn from the Scriptures themselves, demonstratively, in what manner heresies have fallen from truth, and how in the only truth and in the ancient Church, the most perfect knowledge is found." Here he uses the phrase, ancient Church, as Irenæus and Tertullian do, to signify the Church as it was first planted, without distinction of place, or of one apostle over another.

"[3] The Lord alone," saith he, "drank the cup for the purification of those who rejected and betrayed him. Whom the apostles imitating, as being indeed gifted and perfect in knowledge, suffered for the Churches which they founded." He adds no note of distinction, but speaks of all alike.

Again, it is worthy of remark, that the only preference Clement seems to express for one apostle above the others,

[1] Οὕτω τὸ πιστεῦσαι μόνον καὶ ἀναγεννηθῆναι, τελείωσις ἐστὶν ἐν ζωῇ· οὐ γάρ ποτε ἄσθενει ὁ Θεός. ὡς γὰρ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ἔργον ἐστί, καὶ τοῦτο κόσμος ὀνομάζεται· οὕτως καὶ τὸ βούλημα αὐτοῦ ἀνθρώπων ἐστὶ σωτηρία· καὶ τοῦτο ἐκκλησία κέκληται. Οἶδεν οὖν οὓς κέκληκεν, οὓς σέσωσεν· κέκληκεν δὲ ἅμα καὶ σέσωκεν. Clem. Alex. Pædag. lib. i. cap. 6, p. 93.

[2] Ἀποδείξεως δ' οὔσης, ἀνάγκη συγκαταβαίνειν εἰς τὰς ζητήσεις, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν τῶν γραφῶν ἐκμανθάνειν ἀποδεικτικῶς, ὅπως μὲν ἀπεσφάλησαν αἱ αἱρέσεις, ὅπως δὲ καὶ ἐν μόνῃ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἥτε ἀκριβεστάτη γνῶσις. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. vii. p. 755.

[3] Μόνος τοίνυν ὁ Κύριος διὰ τὴν τῶν ἐπιβουλευόντων αὐτῷ ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀπίστων ἀποκάθαρσιν, ἔπιεν τὸ ποτήριον· ὃν μιμούμενοι οἱ ἀπόστολοι, ὡς ἂν τῷ ὄντι γνωστικοί, καὶ τέλειοι, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, ἃς ἔπηξαν, ἔπαθον. Ib. lib. iv. p. 503.

is expressed, not for Peter, but for Paul, calling him in one place, [1] "the good apostle," in another, [2] the "noble apostle," and in two other places, [3] the "divine apostle," whereas he gives Peter no such distinction.

Again, he speaks of the keys, of the Church, and of the apostolical tradition, in a passage, which, though long, it will be proper to give in his own words.

[4] Alluding to the heretics of his day, he says, "Who

[1] ὁ καλὸς ἀπόστολος. Strom. lib. 5. p. 562.

[2] τὸν γενναῖον ἀπόστολον. Strom. lib. 2. p. 420.

[3] ὁ μὲν οὖν θεσπέσιος ἀπόστολος. Strom. lib. 1. p. 316.
τὸν θεῖον ἀπόστολον. Strom. lib. 2. p. 274.

[4] οἱ τοίνυν τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀπτόμενοι λόγων, ἄλλοις τε ἐξάρχοντες, μηδὲ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις τοῖς θείοις ἀλλὰ ἐξημαρτημένως συγχρώμενοι, οὔτε αὐτοὶ εἰσίασιν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, οὔτε οὓς ἐξηπάτησαν, ἐῶσιν τυγχάνειν τῆς ἀληθείας· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὴν κλεῖν ἔχοντες αὐτοὶ τῆς εἰσόδου, ψευδῆ δέ τινα καὶ ὡς φησιν ἡ συνήθεια ἀντικλεῖδα, δι' ἧς οὐ τὴν αὐλαίαν ἀναπετάσαντες, ὥσπερ ἡμεῖς διὰ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου παραδόσεως εἴσιμεν· παράθυραν δὲ ἀνατέμοντες, καὶ διορύξαντες λάθρα τὸ τειχίον τῆς ἐκκλησίας· ὑπερβαίνοντες τὴν ἀλήθειαν, μυσταγωγοὶ τῆς τῶν ἀσεβῶν ψυχῆς καθίστανται. ὅτι γὰρ μεταγενεστέρας τῆς Καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τὰς ἀνθρωπίνας συνηλύσεις πεποιήκασιν, οὐ πολλῶν δεῖ λόγων, ἡ γὰρ τοῦ Κυρίου κατὰ τὴν παρουσίαν διδασκαλία ἀπὸ Αὐγούστου καὶ Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ἀρξαμένη μεσούντων τῶν Αὐγούστου χρόνων τελειοῦται· ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ μέχρι γε τῆς Παύλου λειτουργίας, ἐπὶ Νέρωνος τελειοῦται· κάτω δὲ, περὶ τοὺς Ἀδριάνου τοῦ βασιλέως χρόνους, οἱ τὰς αἱρέσεις ἐπινόησαν γεγόνασι, καὶ μέχρι γε τῆς Ἀντωνίνου τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου διέτειναν ἡλικίας, καθάπερ ὁ Βασιλειδὴς, κἂν Γλαυκίαν ἐπιγράφηται διδάσκαλον, ὡς αὐχοῦσιν αὐτοὶ, τὸν Πέτρου ἑρμηνέα· ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ Οὐαλεντῖνον Θεοδάδι ἀκηκοέναι φέρουσιν, γνώριμος δὲ οὗτος γέγονεν Παύλου. Μαρκίων γὰρ, κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αὐτοῖς ἡλικίαν γενόμενος, ὡς πρεσβύτης, νεωτέροις συνεγένετο, μεθ' ὃν Σίμων ἐπ' ὀλίγον, κηρύσσοντος τοῦ Πέτρου ὑπήκουσεν. ὡς οὕτως ἐχόντων, συμφανὲς ἐκ τῆς προγενεστάτης καὶ ἀληθεστάτης ἐκκλησίας, τὰς μεταγενεστέρας ταύτας, καὶ τὰς ἔτι τούτων ἀποβεβηκυίας. τῷ χρόνῳ κεκαινοτομῆσθαι παραχαραχθείσας αἱρέσεις. ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων ἅρα φάνερον οἶμαι γεγενῆσθαι, μίαν εἶναι τὴν ἀληθῆ ἐκκλησίαν, τὴν τῷ ὄντι ἀρχαίαν, εἰς ἣν οἱ κατὰ πρόθεσιν δίκαιοι ἐγκαταλέγονται . . . . κατά τε οὖν ἀπόστασιν, κατά τε ἐπίνοιαν, κατά τε ἀρχὴν, κατά τε ἕξοχὴν, μόνην εἶναί φαμεν τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ Καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, εἰς ἑνότητα πίστεως μιᾶς τῆς κατὰ τὰς οἰκείας διαθήκας, μᾶλλον δὲ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην τὴν μίαν διαφόροις

use the divine word not rightly, but perversely, neither do they enter the kingdom of heaven themselves, nor suffer those whom they deceive to follow the truth. But they have not the key of the entrance themselves, but a certain false key, or as the common saying is, an anti-key, by which the veil is not unloosed, as it is to us who enter by the tradition of the Lord; but the door is cut off, and the wall of the Church privately dug through. Transgressing the truth, they become the rulers and leaders of the impious mysteries of the soul. But to prove that their conventicles are more recent than the catholic Church, there is no need of many words. For the doctrine which was set forth at the coming of our Lord, as it began with Augustus, so it was finished in the middle of Tiberius' reign; and the teaching of the apostles, to the end of the ministry of Paul, was finished in the time of Nero. But those who have put forth heresies were about the time of the emperor Adrian, and progressed until the age of the elder Antonine, such as Basilides, although he assumed to himself the mastership of Glaucia, who, as they boast, was the interpreter of Peter. In like manner, they say that Valentinus heard Theodades, who was the companion of Paul. But Marcion, who was born in the same age with these, consorted with them as an old man amongst youth, with whom was one Simon, who had listened for a little, while Peter preached. Which things, if they were so, it is clear from the most ancient and true Church, that these are more recent; and those which are still lower down were in their time new heresies

τοῖς χρόνοις ἐνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ βούλήματι, δι' ἑνὸς τοῦ Κυρίου συνάγουσαν τοὺς ἤδη κατατεταγμένους οὓς προώρισεν ὁ Θεὸς, δικαίοις ἰσομένοις πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἐγνωκώς· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ ἐξοχὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καθάπερ ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς συστάσεως, κατὰ τὴν μονάδα ἐστιν, πάντα τὰ ἄλλα ὑπερβάλλουσα, καὶ μηδὲν ἔχουσα ὅμοιον ἢ ἴσον ἑαυτῇ. Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. 7. pp. 764, 5.

of spurious origin. From what has been said, I think it manifest that there is one true Church, that truly which is ancient, in the catalogue of which are reckoned those who are just, according to the divine purpose."——"And with respect to the substance, with respect to knowledge, with respect to its beginning and excellency, we say that there is one only ancient and catholic Church, in the unity of that one faith which is from the proper covenants, or rather, from that covenant which is one in diverse times, in which are gathered together, by the will of God, through one Lord, those who are already ordained to life, whom God predestinated, and knew they would be righteous, before the foundation of the world. And the eminency of this Church, as well as the beginning of its construction, is from unity, overcoming all other things, and having nothing which is its resemblance or its equal."

Now here it is manifest that Clement regards the keys in the sense which Tertullian recognises, namely, the interpretation of Scripture, which the heretics not having, by reason of their false doctrine, they attempt to enter the Church, not by the door, which they cut away, but by undermining the wall of the Church; all which figurative language is ill adapted to the idea, that the Church of which Clement spake was a society to be discovered by its ecclesiastical connection with one particular apostle, or by having its seat at Rome. He goes on to speak of the catholic Church as being one; but he refers this unity to its substance, its knowledge, its beginning, its excellency, and to the unity of the faith, as handed down from the apostles. And the mode in which he presents his argument seems hardly consistent with the notion, that any one apostle was made pastor or governor over the rest, that the whole church was built on Peter, and that his prerogative as chief ruler was committed to his successors in the see of Rome. For under these circumstances,

would he not have confuted the heretics by the short and easy argument, derived from the principality of that Church, instead of resting all his reasoning on a different basis?

How natural and simple would it have been to say: "The Church of Rome, to which the government of the whole kingdom of Christ has been committed, disclaims these heretics. Marcion, Basilides, and Valentinus, have been condemned and cast off by the infallible decision of the vicar of Christ. This is the test of faith, the standard of sound doctrine, the bond of unity." But nothing of the kind, brethren, can be found in the works of Clement. Is the inference unfair, that he did not use your present reasoning simply because he did not hold your doctrine? Or must we suppose, in the face of all probability, that he did truly profess your sentiments with regard to the supremacy of Peter and the maternal domination of the Roman see, and yet omitted the slightest allusion to them in the very argument where they would have been the most appropriate?

The force of this negative testimony, I am well aware, may make very different impressions on different minds. Neither, as I have already intimated, can justice be done to it by extracts. What I have cited, however, is a fair specimen of the mode in which this distinguished father treats the subject throughout: and if you, brethren, can reconcile it with the hypothesis, that he did, notwithstanding, teach your present doctrine, it must be by some process, either of faith or of logic, altogether beyond my comprehension.

CHAPTER XIII.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

NEXT in the order of chronology, I turn to the celebrated Origen, whose name your canon law recognises expressly, those things only being excepted which Jerome disapproves. The judgment of Jerome, I shall extract in full by and by; to show that the passages which are important for our present subject, are not in the least affected by it. So far from this, indeed, is the fact, that Jerome himself will furnish, in due time, strong confirmation.

First, then, let us look at a fine application of the figure of the keys, which will prove, in accordance with the other fathers, how well this term was understood to signify the science of interpretation.

[1] "On account of its obscurity," says Origen, "the whole Scripture, divinely inspired, is like to many cham-

[1] "Similem esse universam Scripturam divinitus afflatam propter obscuritatem quæ in ea est, multis domiciliis uno ædificio conclusis; unicuique domicilio appositam clavem non ipsi convenientem, sicque dissipatas esse claves per domicilia non respondentes singulas iis domiciliis quibus appositæ sunt: opus vero longe difficillimum esse, invenire claves et eas cellis aptare, quas aperire possunt: itaque etiam Scripturas abstrusas quidem illas intelligi, non aliunde sumptis quam ab ipsis invicem argumentis intelligentiæ, quæ in se habent dispersam exponendi rationem." Origen. Com. in Psal. Vide "Origenis in Sacras Scripturas Commentaria," Ed. Col. 1684. tom. i. p. 39. For convenience sake, I have cited, instead of the original Greek, your own Latin version.

bers within one house; the key appropriate to each chamber not being next to it: and so the keys are scattered through the chambers, not answering to those chambers to which they are nearest; and it is truly a difficult work to find the proper keys, and adapt them to the locks which they are fitted to open: thus it is that the more abstruse Scriptures are to be understood, the argument of our knowledge being taken no otherwise than from the Scriptures themselves, which have dispersed amongst them the reasons of their exposition."

Let us next turn to Origen's commentary on Matthew, where we shall see the clearest testimony to the point in question. It will require a very long extract to do it justice; but no labour should be thought too great for the searcher after truth.

After having commented for some time on the confession of Peter, Thou art the Christ, &c., Origen proceeds as follows: [1] "Which if we also shall say, as Peter

[1] Origen. Comment. in Matt. ib. tom. i. p. 274-5. "Quod si postquam dixerimus et nos, quemadmodum Petrus: *Tu es Christus filius Dei vivi,* non quasi revelatum nobis fuerit a carne vel a sanguine, sed luce cordi nostro affulgente a Patre qui in cœlis est, Petrus efficimur; dicatur et nobis a Verbo: *Tu es Petrus,* et quæ sequuntur. Petra enim est omnis discipulus Christi, de quo bibebant, qui *bibebant spiritali consequente petra:* et super quamlibet ejusmodi petram ædificatur omnis sermo Ecclesiasticus, et vitæ juxta ipsum institutæ ratio: unicuique enim perfecto habenti congregationem sermonum beatitudinem perficientium, et operum, et cogitationum, inest Ecclesia a Deo ædificata. Si vero super unum illum solummodo Petrum totam Ecclesiam a Deo ædificari arbitraris, quid de Johanne, tonitru filio, et unoquoque Apostolorum dixeris? Alioquin an audebimus dicere portas Inferi speciatim adversus Petrum non prævalituras, prævalituras autem adversus reliquos Apostolos, et perfectos? Nonne vero et in omnibus et in his singulis sit istud quod supra dictum est: *Portæ Inferi non prævalebunt adversus eam,* et illud quoque: *Super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam?* An etiam soli Petro dantur a Domino claves regni cœlorum, nec quisquam beatorum alius eas accipiet? Quod si et id aliis commune est; *Dabo tibi claves regni cœlorum,* quomodo et non ea quæ præcedunt, communia sunt, et quæ subnectuntur tanquam

did, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, not as if it had been revealed to us by flesh and blood, but by the light shining in our hearts from the Father who is in heaven, we become as Peter, and it may be said by the Word unto us also, Thou art Peter, and what follows. For the rock is every disciple of Christ, from whom they drank who drank of the Spiritual Rock that followed them, and on every such rock every ecclesiastical word is builded, and the system of life instituted accordingly; and in every such perfect man having the combination of words and works and thoughts, perfecting holiness, the Church built by God is found. But if thou thinkest that the whole Church is built by God upon Peter only, what dost thou say of John, the son of thunder, and every one of the other apostles? Or shall we dare to say that the gates of hell were not to prevail specially against Peter? Were they then to prevail against the other apostles and the faithful? Is it not plain, that to all and each the assurance is made good, The gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and this,

in Petrum dicta? Hic etenim velut in Petrum dicta videntur ea: *Quæcunque ligaveris super terram, erunt ligata in cœlis,* et quæ sequuntur: in Evangelio autem Johannis Servator dans Spiritum sanctum Discipulis per insufflationem, dicit: *Accipite Spiritum sanctum,* et quæ sunt deinceps. Proinde multi dicent Servatori: *Tu es Christus filius Dei vivi,* at non omnes illud dicentes, haudquaquam a carne et sanguine revelantibus hoc edocti dicent illi, sed ablato ab ipso Patre qui in cœlis est imposito cordi eorum velamine, ut postea *revelata facie gloriam Domini speculantes* in Spiritu Dei loquantur, dicentes de illo: *Dominus Jesus,* et illi: *Tu es Christus filius Dei vivi.* Et si quis hoc dicit illi, sibi non revelatum e carne et sanguine, sed a Patre qui in cœlis est, ea consequetur, quæ ut ait quidem litera Evangelii, Petro huic dicta sunt; ut docet autem Spiritus illius, cuilibet qui talis evadit, qualis erat ille Petrus. Nomen enim trahunt a Petra omnes imitatores Christi, spiritalis scilicet petræ consequentis eos salvi fiunt, ut ex ea spiritualem potionem ebibant. Illi autem nomen trahunt a Petra, quemadmodum Christus; sed et cum Christi membra sint, nomine ab illo ducto Christiani appellati sunt; a Petra autem, Petri."

also, Upon this rock I will build my Church? Or is it to Peter alone, that the keys of the kingdom of heaven are given, and shall none other of the blessed receive them? And if this is common to the others: I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, how should not those things which precede it, and which are evidently connected with it, as also said to Peter, be common likewise? For here it seems to be said to Peter, Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven, and what follows. But in the Gospel of John, the Saviour, giving the Holy Spirit to the disciples, by breathing on them, says, Receive ye the Holy Ghost, together with what follows. Therefore many will say to the Saviour, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God; but not all who say this, do so because they have been taught by flesh and blood revealing it, but because our Father who is in heaven hath taken away the veil that was on their heart; that afterwards his face being revealed, they, beholding the glory of the Lord, might say by the Spirit of God, Lord Jesus, and to Him, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And if any one say this to Him, the revelation being made, not by flesh and blood, but by the Father which is in heaven, that will follow, which the letter of the Gospel declares was said to Peter; for his spirit teaches him, that whosoever becomes such an one, he is the same as that Peter. For all the imitators of Christ derive their name from the rock—that spiritual rock which follows them who are saved, that from it they should drink spiritual drink. They take their name from their rock, that is, Christ: for as, because they are the members of Christ, by the name derived from Him, they are called Christians, so from his being the rock (Petra), they are called rocks (Petri or Peters)."

[1] "Taking occasion from the same principle," continues Origen, "you may say that Christians are denominated the righteous, from the righteousness of Christ; the wise, from the wisdom of Christ; and you may do the same with all his other names, applying them to the saints; and whosoever shall be such as these names signify, to them it shall be said by the Saviour, Thou art Peter, with what follows to the passage: They shall not prevail against it. What does this word, *It*, signify? Is it the rock on which Christ builds the Church, or the Church? The word is ambiguous: whether is this because the rock and the Church mean the same thing? I think this to be the truth; for neither against the rock, upon which Christ builds the Church, nor against the Church, shall the gates of hell prevail."

"[2] But although the gates of hell are many and almost

[1] Ib. p. 276. "Inde vero accepta occasione justos a Christi justitia, sapientes a Christi sapientia denominatos esse dices; idemque facies de reliquis ejus nominibus, nomina in Sanctos ducens; et quicunque tales fuerint, dicetur iis a Servatore illud quod ita se habet: *Tu es Petrus*, et quæ sequuntur; ad id usque; *Non prævalebunt adversus eam:* Quam autem, *Eam*? an enim petram, super quam Christus ædificat Ecclesiam; an Ecclesiam? ambigua quippe locutio est: an quasi unam eandemque rem, Petram et Ecclesiam? Hoc ego verum esse existimo: nec enim adversus petram, super quam Christus Ecclesiam ædificat, nec adversus Ecclesiam portæ Inferi prævalebunt."

[2] Id. p. 277. B. "At cum multæ sint et vix numerandæ Inferi portæ, nulla Inferi porta prævalebit adversus Petram, vel Ecclesiam quam super illam Christus ædificat."——"Atque id quidem sciendum est, quemadmodum urbium portæ singulæ propria habent nomina; eodem modo portis Inferi pro variis peccatorum formis nomina imponi posse: ita ut una Inferi porta fornicatio appelletur, per quam iter faciunt scortatores; altera autem inficiatio, per quam in infernum descendunt, qui Deum inficiantur. Jam vero et unusquisque illorum qui diversis ab Ecclesia opinionibus adhærent, et aliquam falsi nominis scientiam genuerunt, protam Inferi ædificavit, aliam quidem Marcion, Basilides aliam, et aliam Valentinus. Hic igitur portæ Inferorum dictæ sunt. In Psalmis vero gratias agit Propheta dicens: *Qui exaltas me de portis mortis, ut annuntiem*

innumerable, no gate of hell shall prevail against the rock or the Church which Christ builds upon it."——" And this is also to be known, that as the several gates of cities have their appropriate names, in like manner the names of the several gates of hell may be taken from the various forms of sin: so that one gate of hell is fornication, through which the lewd take their way; another is the denial of justice, through which those descend to hell who deny the claims of God. And truly every one of the heterodox who bring forth any science falsely so called, has built a gate of hell: Marcion has erected one, Basilides another, and Valentinus another. Here, therefore, these gates are called the gates of hell. But in the Psalms the prophet gives thanks, saying: Thou callest me from the gates of death, that I may declare all thy praises in the gates of the daughter of Zion. And from this place we learn that no one can ever declare the praise of God, unless he has been raised from the gates of death, and has attained the gates of Zion. And the gates of Zion may be understood as the opposite to the gates of death: therefore as one gate of death is luxury, so the gate of Zion is chastity; a gate of death again is injustice, but the gate of Zion justice; which the prophet shewing saith: This is the gate of the Lord, the just shall go in thereat: again, the gate of death is fear, the gate of Zion, fortitude; folly is the gate of death, but wisdom is the gate of Zion."

omnes laudationes tuas in portis filiæ Sion. Atque ex hoc loco discimus fieri nunquam posse, ut qui non exaltatus fuerit de portis mortis, et ad portas Sion non pervenerit, omnes laudationes Dei annuntiare possit. Portæ autem Sion contrariæ portis mortis intelligi possint, adeo ut porta mortis sit luxuria; porta autem Sion, castitas, mortis item, injustitia; Sion vero, justitia, quam ostendens Propheta ait: *Hæc porta Domini, justi intrabunt in eam;* et rursum, mortis porta sit timiditas; fortitudo vero, Sion; imprudentia, mortis, contraria autem illi sapientia, Sion."

"[1] We see by all this, how it may be said to Peter, and to every one who is as Peter: I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And first, indeed, I think these words are to be connected with the others: The gates of hell shall not prevail against it; for he who is defended against the gates of hell, so that they prevail not against him, is worthy to receive from the divine Word himself the keys of the kingdom of heaven as a reward, that as the gates of hell could do nothing against

[1] Ib. p. 278. D. "Post hæc videmus, quomodo dictum sit Petro, et cuilibet qui Petrus est; *Dabo tibi claves regni cœlorum.* Et primum quidem existimo his verbis; *Portæ Inferi non prævalebunt adversus eam*, convenienter id esse subnexum; *Dabo tibi claves regni cœlorum:* nam qui contra Inferi portas munitus est, ut adversus eum non prævalerent, dignus est qui ab ipso Verbo claves regni cœlorum accipiat; quasi præmium, quod nihil adversus illum portæ Inferi potuerint, claves accipiens regni cœlorum, ut sibi portas reseret clausas iis qui ab Inferi portis victi sunt: et ingreditur quidem ut castus per portam pudicitiæ, clave pudicitiam aperiente reseratam; et per aliam, ut justus, aperta justitiæ porta clave justitiæ: et sic de cæteris virtutibus. Opinor enim pro unaquaque virtute scientiæ quædam sapientiæ mysteria virtutis formæ congruentia aperiri ei qui juxta virtutem vixerit; dante scilicet Servatore iis qui ab Inferi portis subacti non fuerint totidem claves quot virtutes sunt, totidem numero portas aperientes, unicuique virtuti juxta mysteriorum revelationem respondentes. Fortasse autem unaquæque virtus cœli regnum est, et tota simul regnum cœlorum est; adeo ut juxta id jam in regno cœlorum sit qui vivit secundum virtutes; atque ita ut illud, *Pœnitentiam agite, appropinquavit enim regnum cœlorum*, juxta id non ad tempus, sed ad actiones et affectiones referatur. Christus enim, qui omnis virtus est, præsto est, et loquitur, proptereaque *regnum Dei intra* Discipulos illius est, non autem hic et hic. Vide autem quanta vi polleat petra, super quam a Christo ædificatur Ecclesia, et quicunque dicit: *Tu es Christus, Filius Dei vivi*, ut illius judicia firma maneant; quasi Deo in illo judicante, ut in ipso jure dicendo portæ Inferi adversus eum non prævaleant. Adversus eum igitur qui injuste judicat, et non juxta Verbum Dei ligat super terram, neque ex illius sententia solvit super terram, portæ Inferi prævalent: adversus quem autem portæ Inferi non prævalent, is juste judicat. Idcirco claves habet regni cœlorum, aperiens iis qui soluti sunt super terram, ut in cœlis soluti sint ac liberi; et claudens iis qui justo illius judicio ligati sunt super terram, ut in cœlis ligati ac condemnati sunt."

him, he, receiving the keys of the kingdom of heaven, might open to himself those gates which are shut to all who are overcome by the gates of hell; and thus the key which opens the lock of chastity admits him into the gate of chastity, and the key of righteousness admits him into the gate of righteousness, and so of the other virtues. For I think that for each virtue of knowledge there are certain mysteries of wisdom corresponding to this form of virtue, opened to him who lives according to that virtue; the Saviour giving to those who were not subdued by the gates of hell, as many keys as there are virtues, opening as many gates and corresponding to each virtue according to the revelation of its mysteries. Perhaps too, each virtue is a kingdom of heaven, and the whole together is the kingdom of the heavens; so that he who lives according to these virtues is already in the kingdom of the heavens; and therefore this passage, Repent, for the kingdom of the heavens is at hand, may be referred not to the time, but to actions and affections. For Christ, who is all virtue, is at hand, and declares that the kingdom of heaven is not here or there, but that the kingdom of God is within his disciples. But behold, what power is possessed by the rock on which Christ builds the Church, and by him who says: Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God; the power, namely, that his judgments may remain firm, as if by God, judging in him, that according to the very law it might be said, 'The gates of hell shall not prevail against him.' Therefore against him who judges unjustly, and does not bind according to the word of God upon the earth, nor loose according to his sentence, the gates of hell prevail: but that man against whom the gates of hell do not prevail, judges rightly. For this reason he has the keys of the kingdom of heaven, opening to those who are loosed upon the earth, that in the heavens they may be loosed

and free, and shutting to those who are bound by his just judgment upon earth, that they may also be bound and condemned in the heavens."

" [1] But since there are some who interpret this passage of the episcopacy, as being Peter, and teach that by the keys of the kingdom of heaven, received from the Saviour, those things which are bound by them, that is, condemned, are bound in heaven, and those which are loosed on earth are loosed in heaven; it may be said that they judge truly, if they have the quality, on account of which it was said to Peter: Thou art Peter; and if they are such, that upon them the Church may be built by Christ, and this privilege can be justly granted to them. But the gates of hell ought not to prevail against him who would bind and loose. For if he is bound by the cords of his sins, he binds and looses in vain."——

" Therefore, if any one be not what Peter was, nor be possessed of those qualities which have been mentioned, and yet thinks that he, like Peter, can bind upon the earth, so that those things which he binds shall be also bound in heaven, and that he can loose upon the earth, so that whatever he looses shall be loosed also in heaven, that man is proud, not knowing the sense of the Scrip-

[1] Ib. p. 279. D. "Quoniam autem qui Episcopatus locum vendicant, dictum hoc usurpant, sicut Petrus, et acceptis a Servatore clavibus regni cœlorum docent ea quæ a se ligata sunt, hoc est condemnata, ligata esse et in cœlis, et quæ a se soluta sunt, soluta esse et in cœlis; pronuntiandum est rectè illos dicere, si factum etiam habuerint propter quod Petro huic dictum est; *Tu es Petrus;* ac si tales sunt, ut super illos ædificetur Ecclesia a Christo, et ad illos jure id referri possit. Portæ autem Inferi prævalere non debent adversus eum qui ligare vult et solvere. Quod si *funibus peccatorum suorum constringitur,* frustra et ligat et solvit."

"Si quis autem qui Petrus non fuerit, nec ea habuerit quæ hic dicta sunt, sicut Petrus ligaturum se credit super terram, ita ut quæ ligata fuerint, sint ligata et in cœlis; et soluturum se super terram, ita ut quæ soluta fuerint, sint soluta et in cœlis, superbus ille est, nesciens Scripturarum sensum, et *superbia elatus in crimen incidit Diaboli.*" Ib. p. 280.

tures, and being lifted up with pride he falls into the crime of the devil."

It is surely impossible, brethren, to ask for language more plain than this, to prove that Origen had no knowledge of the doctrine of your supremacy. He takes notice, indeed, of the claim which some were beginning to put forth on behalf of the bishops in general, that the power of the keys granted to Peter was a power belonging to *the Episcopacy;* but that this was appropriated to any one bishop as superior over the rest, or that any one diocese was the mother and mistress of all the Churches, because it was the see of St. Peter,—these notions had evidently not reached Origen's ears, or it is manifest that he would have alluded to them in his commentary. His views in the main, seem the same as those of Tertullian, that the keys of the kingdom were granted alike to every spiritual Christian. He considers the Church built by Christ upon the rock, against which the gates of hell should not prevail, as being the kingdom of God established in the soul; and his entire view of this famous passage of the divine word, by which you endeavour to defend your title to universal dominion, is utterly subversive of your claim to the sanction of the primitive day.

I am aware that you are accustomed to evade the testimony of Origen by condemning him as a heretic. And therefore, I proceed to prove the high character given to him by your own writers, and especially by Jerome, the greatest oracle amongst the fathers, according to your own canon law.

The distinguished *Huetius*, one of the most learned writers of your communion, treating on the very point whether Origen should be considered as a heretic, denies that he was so, although there were many erroneous things in his books. He rests his opinion on these grounds: that although Demetrius, the bishop of Alex-

andria, with the consent of many others, condemned Origen, yet his cause was maintained by Palestine, Arabia, Phenice, and Achaia, and he was continued and died in the communion of the catholic Church: that the clamour raised against him was the result of envy; that he delivered the profession of his faith to Fabian the bishop of Rome; and that Leo III. at a later day, inserted many extracts from the works of Origen in the Roman breviary. Huetius also well remarks, that if every man is to be adjudged a heretic whose works contain passages contrary to the approved doctrine of the Church of Rome, "the greater part of the orthodox fathers must also be called heretics, such as Irenæus, Papias, Cyprian," &c. and lastly, he quotes with approbation the sentiment of Jerome concerning Origen, where he says: "This one thing I declare freely: I would willingly take the prejudice against his name, if I could have therewith his knowledge of the Scriptures; and I should make very light of those phantoms, those shades of goblins or ghosts, the nature of which is said to be, to frighten children and to gibber in the dark[1]."

[1] "Qui contrarias autem sectantur partes, talia regerunt, a Demetrio licet, plurimisque ipsi consentientibus Episcopis segregatus fuerit ab Ecclesia Origenes, ipsius tamen causam suscepisse et propugnasse Palestinam, Arabiam, Phœniciam, et Achaiam: et juxta testificationem Hieronymi, non ipsius errores, sed adversariorum invidiam has ei turbas peperisse."——"Quis Ecclesiæ communionem simulate secretum eum existimet, qui fidei professionem ad Fabianum Papam dedit, exorientes hæreses acerrime insectatus est, nullam cum hæreticis societatem iniit, Catholicorum Episcoporum familiaritate ad mortem usque constanter usus est?"——"Denique suam famam et nomen satis asseruit Leo III., Pontifex Maximus, cum inter Lectiones ex Patrum lucubrationibus decerptas, et Romano insertas Breviario, nonnullas quoque ex Origenianis libris petitas eidem inseruit."

"Qui ergo omnem hæreseos suspicionem ab Origene abesse volunt, cum iis qui invidioso Hæretici nomine ipsum infamant, ita conciliari posse censeo; si duplici notione sumi Hæretici appellationem dicamus, vel ad eum significandum qui hæresin aut fabrefecerit aut secutus sit, eam licet

In another part of this very learned treatise, your author, Huetius, states the fact, that after Origen's death his doctrines were held in universal estimation, so much so indeed, that Methodius, the bishop of Tyre, who had impugned them, could find no one to agree with him: almost all adhered to Origen. And this extraordinary honour continued until the time of Arius, who, deriving some support for his opinions, as was supposed, from the writings of Origen, brought them into disrepute with many [1].

But I am not concerned so much with the defence of Origen's opinions, as with the simple question of his testimony on the antiquity of your claims. And I beg leave to observe, brethren, that the universal credit which his name obtained for such a length of time, gives more than common weight to this testimony. If, as you say, our Redeemer granted to Peter a power of authority and government over the other apostles, and this power or

ejurare paratus, simulatque fuisse ab Ecclesia repudiata; vel ad designandum eum qui non hæreseos duntaxat auctor et assecla; sed perpetuus etiam propugnator, et pertinax adversus Ecclesiæ auctoritatem assertor fuerit: priore igitur notione Hæretici nomen a Patribus Adamantio imponi, ut hæreseos auctor, non assertor significetur. Quo sensu orthodoxi quoque Patres quamplurimi hæretici dici possunt, velut Irenæus, Papias, Cyprianus, et alii."

"Acquiescamus igitur in hoc Hieronymi placito e Traditionibus Ebraicis: *Hoc unum dico: vellem cum invidia nominis ejus habere etiam scientiam Scripturarum, flocci pendens imagines, umbrasque larvarum, quarum natura esse dicitur, terrere parvulos, et in angulis garrire tenebrosis.*" Vide Origenianorum, Pet. Dan. Huet. lib. 2. cap. 3. pp. 194, 5.

[1] "Sane tanta erat his temporibus Origenianæ doctrinæ celebritas et existimatio, ut hinc ad facti pœnitentiam adductum fuisse credam Methodium, cum vix quemquam ad suas pelliceret partes; cuncti ferme Adamantio adhærescerent." Pet. D. Huet. Origenianorum, lib. 2. § 3. p. 197.

"A Methodii ætate ad Ariana tempora suus Origeni honos videtur constitisse. Orto autem Ario patrocinium hæresi suæ quærentes Ariani Adamantii nomen causæ suæ prætexere studuerunt." Ib.

authority was conferred upon the successors of Peter in the Church of Rome, so that, by divine right, Peter first, and the bishops of Rome after him, were regarded as holding the place of Christ and God upon the earth, it is impossible that any of the fathers whom I have cited could have been ignorant of it, and especially was this impossible in a doctor of such reputation and influence as Origen. But so far was Origen from maintaining this doctrine, that he interprets *the very passages* of Scripture on which you rest, as if he had never heard of such a claim: and is yet so unconscious of any wrong done to the bishop of Rome, that he sends him a written statement of his opinions. Mark, too, I beseech you, what your Huetius records, that Demetrius, the bishop of Alexandria, was the author and inciter of all the opposition against Origen [1]. Why was not the bishop of Rome active against him, if that bishop then claimed his present prerogatives? Why was not Origen then attacked on this very ground? Nay, even when Jerome, long afterwards, published those censures of Origen's errors which are adopted as a part of your own canon law, why were not his sentiments, so adverse to the primacy, exposed to reprobation [2].

The answer to all this can only be found in the *fact*, that the primitive Church of Rome advanced no such claim, nor had the primitive Church Catholic at this time ever heard of it.

[1] "Demonstratum est autem turbarum omnium, quæ adversus Origenem magno Ecclesiæ detrimento concitatæ sunt, auctorem et incentorem fuisse Demetrium Alexandrinum." Ib. § 1. p. 196.

[2] The judgment of Jerome concerning Origen's works will be found in that part of the volume where the testimony of Jerome is examined.

CHAPTER XIV.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

THE regular examination of the testimony of antiquity, brings us next to that justly celebrated man, who was so warm an admirer of Tertullian, the distinguished Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, and a martyr. He flourished about A.D. 250, and as there is no subject more frequent in his writings than the Church and the episcopate, so there is none on which his doctrines are more at variance with your present claims of supremacy.

In examining his testimony, however, candour requires that all which appears to favour your system should be fully set forth, and therefore I shall commence with the passages which seem to justify your ground, and then proceed to those which demonstrate the difference between the primacy acknowledged by Cyprian, and the primacy claimed by you.

"There is one God," says Cyprian, "and one Christ, and one Church, and one chair founded by the voice of the Lord upon Peter. No other altar can be erected, no new priesthood can be established, besides that one altar and that one priesthood. Whoever attempts to gather elsewhere, scatters [1]."

[1] "Deus unus est, et Christus unus, et una ecclesia, et cathedra una super Petrum Domini voce fundata. Aliud altare constitui, aut sacer-

Again, speaking of the election of Cornelius as bishop of Rome, he uses this language[1], "He" (sc. Cornelius) "was made bishop by many of our colleagues who were then at Rome, who sent unto us illustrious letters to his praise and honour, in testimony of his preaching and his ordination. And Cornelius was therefore made bishop by the judgment of God and of Christ, by the testimony of almost all the clergy, by the suffrage of the people who were present, and by the college of priests and of ancient and good men; and no one was appointed before him, when the place of Fabian, that is, the place of Peter and the degree of his sacerdotal chair, was vacant, which he now occupies by the will of God and the consent of us all."

I shall have occasion to advert to this passage again, when your change of the primitive plan of electing your popes is in question. The difference between the mode in which Cyprian relates this matter and your present mode of electing by your college of cardinals, without the slightest agency on the part of either clergy or people, is striking indeed. But I quote it now, in order to give you the benefit of that part of it, in which the see of Rome is called the chair of Peter.

Again, complaining of the schismatical attempt of

dotium novum fieri præter unum altare, et unum sacerdotium, non potest. Quisquis alibi collegerit, spargit." Cyp. ad Pleb. Epist. p. 59.

[1] "Et factus est Episcopus a plurimis collegis nostris, qui tunc in urbe Roma aderant, qui ad nos litteras honorificas, et laudabiles, et testimonio suæ prædicationis illustres de ejus ordinatione miserunt. Factus est autem Cornelius Episcopus de Dei et Christi judicio, de Clericorum pene omnium testimonio, de plebis, quæ tunc affuit suffragio, et de sacerdotum, antiquorum et bonorum virorum collegio; cum nemo ante se factus esset, cum Fabiani locus, id est, cum locus Petri et gradus Cathedræ sacerdotalis vacaret, quo occupato de Dei voluntate, atque omnium nostrum consensione firmato," &c. Cyp. Epist. ad Antonian. p. 75.

Novatian to become the bishop of Rome, Cyprian says[1]: "Afterwards they presume to rest upon a false bishop appointed by heretics, and to carry letters from schismatics and profane persons to the chair of Peter and to the principal Church, from whence the ecclesiastical unity has arisen; nor do they recollect that they are Romans, (whose faith in the apostles' preaching is praised) to whom perfidy can have no access."

Once more, Cyprian, speaking of heretical baptisms, says[2], "There is one baptism, and one Holy Spirit, and one Church founded on Peter by Christ our Lord, for the sake and the origin of unity."

Now these passages look very like your doctrine, and yet, when faithfully compared with others from the same writer, do in reality prove nothing of the kind. The idea of Cyprian was, that the apostolic or the episcopal office was one, that the calling of Peter and the giving him his official authority was the beginning of it, and therefore that the Church was founded on him, in and with whom the other apostles were included, for the better maintaining of this unity. That the Church of Rome was the seat of Peter, Cyprian doubtless believed; and therefore he attaches the same importance to it, that he attaches to Peter in relation to the other apostles; but all this amounted to no more than what belongs to the foreman of a jury, the senior judge upon the bench, the precedency among peers, or any other case, in which a

[1] "Post ista adhuc insuper pseudo-episcopo sibi ab hæreticis constituto, navigare audent, et ad Petri cathedram atque ad Ecclesiam principalem, unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est, a schismaticis et profanis litteras ferre, nec cogitare eos esse Romanos (quorum fides, Apostolo prædicante, laudata est) ad quos perfidia habere non possit accessum." Cyp. ad Cornel. de Fortunat. et Felic. p. 95.

[2] "Quando et baptisma unum sit, et Spiritus Sanctus unus, et una Ecclesia a Christo Domino super Petrum origine unitatis et ratione fundata." Cyp. Epist. ad Januar. p. 138.

number being united in the same work with the same powers, one, for the sake of order, goes before the rest. That this was the extent of Cyprian's deference to the bishop of Rome will be abundantly manifest from the following extracts.

[1] "Our Lord," saith he, "whose precepts we ought to reverence and observe, establishing the honour of the bishop and the system of his Church, speaks in the Gospel, and says to Peter: I say to thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not overcome it, and I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Thence, by the flux of times and successions, the ordination of bishops and the system of the Church runs along, so that the Church is built upon the bishops, and every act of the Church is governed by those presidents, and this is by the divine law," &c.

Again [2] saith Cyprian, "By Christ, there is one Church through the whole world divided in many members; for the episcopate is one, diffused by the harmonious host

[1] "Dominus noster, cujus præcepta metuere et observare debemus, Episcopi honorem, et Ecclesiæ suæ rationem disponens in Evangelio loquitur, et dicit Petro: Ego tibi dico, quia tu es Petrus, et super istam petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam, et portæ Inferorum non vincent eam, et tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum, et quæ ligaveris super terram, erunt ligata et in cœlis, et quæcumque solveris super terram, erunt soluta et in cœlis. Inde per temporum et successionum vices, Episcoporum ordinatio, et Ecclesiæ ratio decurrit, ut Ecclesia super Episcopos constituatur: et omnis actus Ecclesiæ per eosdem Præpositos gubernetur. Cum hoc itaque divina lege fundatum sit," &c. Cyprian. Lapsis Epist. p. 42.

[2] "Cum sit a Christo una Ecclesia per totum mundum in multa membra divisa, item Episcopatus unus, Episcoporum multorum concordi numerositate diffusus; ille post Dei traditionem, post connexam et ubique conjunctam Catholicæ Ecclesiæ unitatem," &c. Cyp. ad Antonian. Epist. p. 81.

of many bishops, and this, according to the tradition of God, is the connected and every where conjoined unity of the catholic Church," &c.

Again[1], "The episcopate," says he, "is one, of which a part is held by each bishop, with an interest in the whole. The Church also is one, which is extended more widely by the increase of its fecundity; in like manner there are many rays of the sun, but one light; and many branches of the tree, but one strength founded in the firm root; and though many rivulets flow from one fountain, and although the number of these streams is diffused in the extent of overflowing abundance, nevertheless unity is preserved in the origin."

Again, in a passage which is full of excellent instruction to the ministers of Christ, Cyprian states as follows[2]: "In all things," saith he, "we ought to hold the unity

[1] "Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur. Ecclesia quoque una est, quæ in multitudinem latius incremento fecunditatis extenditur: quo modo solis multi radii, sed lumen unum: et rami arboris multi, sed robur unum tenaci radice fundatum: et cum de fonte uno rivi plurimi defluunt, numerositas licet diffusa videatur exundantis copiæ largitate, unitas tamen servatur in origene." Cyp. de unitat. Eccles. p. 208.

[2] "Per omnia debemus Ecclesiæ Catholicæ unitatem tenere, nec in aliquo fidei et veritatis hostibus cedere. Non est autem de consuetudine præscribendum, sed ratione vincendum. Nam nec Petrus quem primum Dominus elegit, et super quem ædificavit Ecclesiam suam, cum secum Paulus de circumcisione postmodum disceptaret, vindicavit sibi aliquid insolenter, aut arroganter assumpsit; ut diceret se primatum tenere, et obtemperari a novellis et posteris sibi potius oportere. Nec despexit Paulum quod ecclesiæ prius persecutor fuisset, sed consilium veritatis admisit, et rationi legitimæ quam Paulus vindicabat, facile consensit; documentum scilicet nobis et concordiæ et patientiæ tribuens, ut non pertinaciter nostra amemus, sed quæ aliquando a fratribus et collegis nostris utiliter et salubriter suggeruntur, si sint vera et legitima, ipsa potius nostra ducamus. Cui rei Paulus quoque prospiciens, et concordiæ et paci fideliter consulens in epistola sua posuit, dicens: Prophetæ autem duo aut tres loquantur, et cæteri examinent: si autem alii revelatum fuerit sedenti, ille prior taceat," &c. Cypriani Epist. ad Quint. p. 140.

of the catholic Church, nor in any thing of faith and virtue should we yield to her enemies. We should not admit the prescription of custom, but should rather be overcome by reason. For Peter, whom the Lord chose first, and upon whom he built his Church, when Paul disputed with him on the subject of circumcision, claimed nothing insolently to himself, nor arrogantly assumed any thing. Nor did he say that he held the primacy, and that it was fit that Paul should comply with him in his new and lately devised ways. Nor did he despise Paul because he had been a persecutor of the Church, but admitted the counsel of truth, and readily yielded to the lawful argument which Paul set forth; thus leaving to us an example of concord and patience, that we should not love our own notions too well, but should yield occasionally to those things which our brethren and colleagues usefully and wisely suggest, and if they are true and lawful, prefer their suggestions to our own. To which thing Paul also looking forward, and consulting faithfully for the interest of concord and peace, placed this maxim in his epistle, saying: 'Let the prophets speak by two or three, and let the others examine: but if any thing be revealed to another sitting by, let the first hold his peace,'" &c.

These passages show clearly the equality of right and authority claimed by Cyprian in relation to the bishop of Rome; and his conviction that the primacy of Peter and the primacy of the Roman church conferred no right of jurisdiction on the apostle over his brethren, nor on the bishop of any one diocese over the rest. But the matter does not rest upon these proofs alone. There are other passages still more conclusive, which I cannot pass by in justice to the truth.

Thus, in many of the epistles of Cyprian, speaking of

Cornelius, then bishop of Rome, he calls him[1] "his colleague," his "fellow bishop," "his brother," in no one instance giving him any title of superior respect or reverence, but invariably using the language of the most absolute equality.

Again, assigning the reason why Rome takes precedence of Carthage, he makes not the slightest allusion to any difference among the apostles, or amongst the bishops who succeeded them; but puts it on the ground of local advantage, according to the principle mentioned before. "Plainly, therefore," saith he, "on account of its magnitude, Rome ought to precede Carthage[2]."

But nothing tries the strength of comparative authority, like the occurrence of a dispute or controversy; and this test offers itself as the most irrefragable evidence of the doctrine held on the point of supremacy by our present witness. It is familiarly known to you, brethren, that Stephen, the bishop of Rome, next but one after Cornelius, maintained the validity of baptism when administered by heretics and schismatics, and was warmly opposed on this account by Cyprian and the bishops of Africa, who held a provincial council on the subject. And it ought to be as familiarly known, that Cyprian, and his colleagues of Africa, yielded not one jot to their brother and colleague of Rome, but defended their position with the most absolute independence and equality. Some of the many passages which prove this assertion, I shall now place before you.

The epistle written to Stephen by Cyprian and the

[1] "Cum Cornelio, coëpiscopo nostro."—"Cornelium collegam nostrum." Cyp. Epist. ad Antonian. p. 73.

"Cognovimus, frater charissime, fidei, ac virtutis vestræ." Cyp. Epist. ad Cornelium, p. 104.

[2] "Planè quondam pro magnitudine sua debeat Carthaginem Roma præcedere." Cyp. ad Cornelium, Epist. 70.

rest, after the holding of the council, furnishes our first authority.

"[1] In order to correct and dispose certain matters," saith he, "by the examination of common counsel, we found it necessary, most dear brother, to collect together many bishops into one, and celebrate a council. In which many things truly were proposed and transacted; but that about which we desired most to write to you, and confer with your gravity and wisdom, and which concerns most nearly the authority of the priesthood, and the unity and dignity of the catholic Church derived from the ordination of the divine will, was the subject of those who are baptized without the Church, stained with profane water amongst heretics and schismatics, and who, when they come to us and to the Church which is one, we judged it fit to have baptized, because we think it little worth to give them the imposition of hands for the reception of the Holy Spirit, unless they have first received the baptism of the Church." After this introduction, Cyprian proceeds to explain and support his doctrine, and concludes in the following words, viz.

"[2] These things we have addressed to your conscience

[1] "Ad Stephanum Papam de Concilio."

"Cyprianus et cæteri Stephano, Salutem.

"Ad quædam disponenda et consilii communis examinatione limanda, necesse habuimus, frater charissime, convenientibus in unum pluribus sacerdotibus cogere et celebrare concilium. In quo multa quidem prolata atque transacta sunt; sed de eo vel maxime tibi scribendum, et cum tua gravitate ac sapientia conferendum fuit, quod magis pertineat et ad sacerdotalem auctoritatem et ad Ecclesiæ catholicæ unitatem pariter ac dignitatem, de divinæ dispositionis ordinatione venientem, eos qui sint foris extra Ecclesiam tincti, et apud hæreticos et schismaticos profanæ aquæ labe maculati, quando ad nos atque ad Ecclesiam, quæ una est, venerint, baptizari oportere: eo quod parum sit eis manum imponere ad accipiendum Spiritum sanctum, nisi accipiant et Ecclesiæ baptismum." Cyp. Opp. p. 141.

[2] "Hæc ad conscientiam tuam, frater charissime, et pro honore communi, et pro simplici dilectione pertulimus, credentes etiam tibi pro

most dear brother, for the common honour and for sincere love, believing that those things which are religious and true, will also be acceptable to you in the truth of your faith and religion. But we know that certain men are unwilling to lay aside any opinion which they have ever imbibed, or to change readily their own purpose; but the bond of peace and concord amongst their colleagues being preserved, they retain whatever sentiments they have once adopted. In which matter we neither give law nor offer violence to any one; since every bishop exercises the free choice of his own will in the administration of the Church, having to render an account of his acts to the Lord. We wish you, most dear brother, all prosperity."

Stephen, however, as you know, brethren, neither adopted the counsel of the African bishops, nor allowed them the right to decide the matter for themselves; but asserting against them the custom of the Church of Rome, and claiming its descent from the time of the apostles, he took it upon him, as Victor had done in the days of Irenæus about the Easter controversy, to refuse communion with those that dissented from his doctrine. Had your present system been, at that time, the acknowledged system of the Church, this act of Stephen would have produced one of these two results: either Cyprian and his African colleagues must have submitted immediately, or they must have been cut off as obstinate schismatics. But neither of these results were appre-

religionis tuæ et fidei veritate placere, quæ et religiosa pariter et vera sunt. Cæterum scimus quosdam quod semel imbiberint nolle deponere, nec propositum suum facile mutare, sed salvo inter collegas pacis et concordiæ vinculo, quædam propria, quæ apud se semel sint usurpata, retinere. Qua in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus aut legem damus; cum habeat in Ecclesiæ administratione voluntatis suæ arbitrium liberum unusquisque præpositus, rationem actus sui Domino redditurus. Optamus te, frater charissime, semper bene valere." Ib. p. 142.

hended, nor did either take place. Cyprian did not submit, but severely censured Stephen for his course, and denied the truth of the Roman tradition. And yet so far was he from being condemned for his independence, that he stands upon your list as a saint, and is termed the blessed Cyprian by your own canon law. What gives the greater force to this example is the fact with which you are well acquainted, that the council of Arles, in the early part of the following century, long after both these parties had resigned their earthly stewardship, adopted the sentiment of Stephen on the very point in question: so that the independence of Cyprian and his resistance to Stephen, cannot be tolerated on the ground that the *doctrine* of Cyprian was right. His independence was right, although his doctrine was wrong; and hence, as we shall see when we come to the history of that council, the very same men who adopted the doctrine of Stephen on the point of baptism, confirmed the independence of the African Church.

But I have other proofs to offer of the general resistance to the bishop of Rome on this occasion. Firmilian, the bishop of Cappadocia, in a letter to Cyprian, saith [1],

[1] "Qualis vero error sit, et quanta sit cæcitas ejus qui remissionem peccatorum dicit apud synagogas hæreticorum dari posse, nec permanet in fundamento unius Ecclesiæ quæ semel a Christo supra petram solidata est; hinc intelligi potest, quod soli Petro Christus dixerit: Quæcunque ligaveris super terram, erunt ligata et in cœlis, et quæcunque solveris super terram, erunt soluta et in cœlis, et iterum in Evangelio quando in solos Apostolos insufflavit Christus dicens: Accipite Spiritum sanctum: si cujus remiseritis peccata, remittentur illi; et si cujus tenueritis, tenebuntur. Potestas ergo peccatorum remittendorum Apostolis data est, et ecclesiis quas illi a Christo missi constituerunt, et episcopis qui eis ordinatione vicaria successerunt. Hostes autem unius catholicæ ecclesiæ in qua nos sumus, et adversarii nostri qui Apostolis successimus, sacerdotia sibi illicita contra nos vindicantes, et altaria prophana ponentes; quid aliud sunt quam Chore et Dathan et Abiron, pari scelere sacrilegi, et easdem quas et illi pœnas daturi cum

" How great is the error, how strange the blindness of him who says that the remission of sins can be given in the synagogues of heretics, and continues not upon the foundation of that one Church, which was once built by Christ upon the rock; he should understand that to Peter alone, Christ said, Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall also be loosed in heaven. And again, in the gospel, when Christ breathed only on his apostles, saying to them: Receive the Holy Ghost: whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted to them, and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained. The power therefore of remitting sins was given to the apostles, and to the Churches which they, being sent from Christ, established, and to the bishops which succeeded them by regular ordination. But those enemies of that one catholic Church in which we are, those adversaries of us who have succeeded the apostles, defending their unlawful priesthood against us, and setting up a profane altar,—what else are they but Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, in an equal sin of sacrilege, and sure to obtain for all who unite with them the same punishment; even as we know that the companions and favourers of these men perished with themselves. Therefore I am justly indignant at this open and manifest folly of Stephen, who, although he so boasts of the place of his bishoprick, and contends that he holds the succession of Peter, upon whom the foundations of the Church were placed, nevertheless brings in

his qui sibi consentiunt, secundum quod etiam tunc illorum participes et fautores pariter cum eis perierunt. Atque ego in hac parte juste indignor ad hanc tam apertam et manifestam Stephani stultitiam, quod qui sic de Episcopatus sui loco gloriatur, et se successionem Petri tenere contendit, super quem fundamenta ecclesiæ collocata sunt, multas alias petras inducat, et ecclesiarum multarum nova ædificia constituat, dum esse illic baptisma sua auctoritate defendit." Firmilian. ad Cyprian. Epist. Opp. Cyp. p. 157.

other rocks, and builds the new edifices of many Churches, while he defends their baptism by his authority."

Again, in another passage of the same epistle, we find the following: [1] "Those who are of Rome do not in all things observe what was delivered from the beginning, and they vainly pretend the authority of the apostles. Every one may know, that with respect to the day for keeping Easter, and many other rites of religion, there are diversities amongst them, nor do they equally observe there, all those things which are observed at Jerusalem. The same diversity may be seen in many of the provinces: many things are varied through the changes of times and language, and yet there is no departure, on this account, from the peace and unity of the catholic Church. But Stephen has presumed to disturb this concord and unity, breaking towards you the peace which his predecessors always maintained with you in love and mutual honour: even defaming the blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, as if they delivered his doctrine."

And again, [2] "We," saith Firmilian, "join custom to truth, and we oppose to the custom of the Romans a

[1] "Eos autem qui Romæ sunt non ea in omnibus observare quæ sint ab origine tradita, et frustra apostolorum auctoritatem prætendere: scire quis etiam inde potest, quod circa celebrandos dies paschæ, et circa multa alia divinæ rei sacramenta, videat esse apud illos aliquas diversitates, nec observari illic omnia æqualiter, quæ Hierosolymis observantur. Secundum quod in cæteris quoque plurimis provinciis, multa pro locorum et nominum diversitate variantur; nec tamen propter hoc ab Ecclesiæ Catholicæ pace atque unitate aliquando discessum est. Quod nunc Stephanus ausus est facere, rumpens adversus vos pacem, quam semper antecessores ejus vobiscum amore et honore mutuo custodierunt: adhuc etiam infamans Petrum et Paulum beatos Apostolos, quasi hoc ipsi tradiderint." Ib. p. 159.

[2] "Cæterum nos veritati et consuetudinem jungimus, et consuetudini Romanorum consuetudinem sed veritatis opponimus; ab initio hoc tenentes quod a Christo et ab Apostolo traditum est." Ib. p. 164.

custom which is of truth, holding from the beginning what has been delivered by Christ and the apostle."

That Cyprian fully agreed in these sentiments of his colleague Firmilian, is sufficiently evident from what I have already cited; but I shall confirm it by a few extracts from one epistle more, which shall close his testimony on the point in question.

In a letter written by Cyprian to Pompey, one of the African bishops, on the conduct of Stephen, he expresses himself as follows, viz.

[1] "Although we have embraced fully all that is to be said upon the baptism of heretics, in the epistles of which

[1] "Quanquam plene ea quæ de hæreticis baptizandis dicenda sunt, complexi sumus in epistolis, quarum ad te exempla transmisimus, frater charissime, tamen quia desiderasti in notitiam tuam perferri, quæ mihi ad litteras nostras Stephanus frater noster rescripserit, misi tibi rescripti ejus exemplum; quo lecto magis ac magis ejus errorem denotabis, qui hæreticorum causam contra Christianos, et contra Ecclesiam Dei asserere conatur. Nam inter cætera vel superba, vel ad rem non pertinentia, vel sibi ipsi contraria, quæ imperite atque improvide scripsit, etiam illud adjunxerit, ut diceret: [si quis ergo a quacunque hæresi venerit ad nos, nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est, ut manus illi imponatur in pœnitentiam:" &c.]——"Unde est ista traditio? Utrum ne de dominica et Evangelica auctoritate descendens, an de Apostolorum mandatis atque epistolis veniens? Ea enim facienda esse quæ scripta sunt, Deus testatur, et proponit ad Jesum Nave dicens: Non recedet liber legis hujus ex ore tuo, sed meditaberis in eo die ac nocte, ut observes facere omnia quæ scripta sunt in eo. Item Dominus Apostolos suos mittens, mandat baptizari gentes et doceri, ut observent omnia quæcunque ille præcepit. Si ergo aut in Evangelio præcipitur, aut in Apostolorum Epistolis, aut Actibus continetur, ut a quacumque hæresi venientes non baptizentur, sed tantum manus illis imponantur in pœnitentiam, observetur divina hæc et] sancta traditio."——"Ut nemo infamare Apostolos debeat, quasi illi hæreticorum baptismata probaverint;"——"quæ ista obstinatio est, quæve præsumptio, humanam traditionem divinæ dispositioni anteponere, nec animadvertere, indignari et irasci Deum, quoties divina præcepta solvit et præterit humana traditio?" Cyp. epist. ad Pomp. contra Epist. Stephan. p. 152, 3.

we sent you copies, most dear brother, nevertheless, since you have desired to be informed what our brother Stephen returned in answer to our letter, I have sent to you a copy of his reply; which, when you have read, you will see more and more his error, in endeavouring to assert the cause of heretics against Christians, and against the Church of God. For amongst other proud and irrelevant things, and contradictions which he has unskilfully and thoughtlessly written, he has added the following: If therefore any one, from any of the heresies, shall come to us, let nothing of novelty be brought in, beyond the tradition that hands shall be laid on him in penitence," &c. . . . "But whence is this tradition? Is it that which descends from the authority of our Lord and of his Gospel, or which comes to us from the precepts of the apostles and their epistles? For those things which are written are to be done, as the Lord testifies and proposes to Joshua, saying, This book of the law shall not depart from thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do all things which are written therein. In like manner, the Lord, sending his apostles, commands them to teach and baptize the nations, that they may observe all things which he had commanded them. If, therefore, it is either directed in the Gospel, or contained in the epistles of the apostles, or in the Acts, that those who come from any heresy shall not be baptized, but only have hands laid on them in repentance, let this divine and holy tradition be observed."..... "But let no one defame the apostles, as if they approved the baptism of heretics." . . . "How great is this obstinacy, how bold this presumption, to place this human tradition before the divine sanction, forgetting that God is always indignant and wrathful, whenever human traditions are exalted above his precepts!"

Here, then, brethren, we have a practical demonstration of Cyprian's views upon this important question, too plain to be fairly evaded, and rendering it impossible for an unprejudiced mind to believe that the doctrine of the catholic Church in his days was at all accordant with your present claims on the subject of papal supremacy. For, I beseech you, did Cyprian attribute to Peter any authority over Paul and the other apostles, when he said that on Peter the first foundation of the Church was laid? Did he grant any power of government to the bishop of Rome, when he called him the successor of Peter, and termed his diocese the principal seat? Did he believe that Cornelius and Stephen were the vicars of Christ, holding the place of God upon the earth, or that his opinions were to be controlled by theirs, in any point of Christian theory or practice? Does he not, on the contrary, plainly and repeatedly say, that the episcopate of the whole Church is one, of which each bishop holds a part? Does he not declare that the Church is built on the apostles, and on the bishops, their successors; and place the unity of the Church, not on the agreement of the bishops with the Roman see, but on their concord and agreement together? Does he not address the bishops of Rome precisely as he addresses the bishops of Africa, and expressly assert their mutual independence, each bishop being solely accountable to God? Does he not explain what he meant in styling the Church of Rome "the principal see," by saying, that "*on account of its superior magnitude*, Rome ought to precede Carthage?" Does he not refuse to change the custom of Carthage to the custom of Rome, and call that custom a human tradition opposed to truth? Does he not deny that any thing can be properly called an apostolical tradition, unless it be found in Scripture? And does he not condemn the bishop of Rome with the utmost freedom, when he thinks

him in error, and even impeach him of pride, of ignorance, and of obstinacy?

Now, brethren, I only ask, what provincial bishop of your Church would dare to write and act thus at the present day? Yet Cyprian was not blamed for his independence. Like Victor in the days of Irenæus, Stephen was censured for his tyrannical assumption of power, but the African bishops kept on their way, and continued in the communion of the catholic Church, although, through his own folly, they were not in communion with Stephen. And Cyprian closed his life by a glorious martyrdom, and stands high on your calendar as one of the blessed, and is enrolled in your canon law; while Stephen, his antagonist, though the council of Arles sanctioned his doctrine, attained no such distinction. And can you, with these facts before you, say that your system has not changed? Can you think that your present claims for the bishop of Rome, and the dominion of his see, as "the mother and mistress of all the Churches," have any real warrant from primitive antiquity?

CHAPTER XV.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

THE name of Lactantius, who is commonly set down about A. D. 306, and that of Eusebius, the bishop of Cesarea, who is a few years later, are all that I shall place before you, previous to the council of Nice. Of these, Lactantius stands first in order.

The testimony of this author is merely negative; and yet it seems worthy of great consideration. For what writer giving a description of your religion at this day, and speaking of Peter, and of Rome, would omit all allusion to the primacy?

If he believed that Peter was the prince of the apostles, having dominion over the rest, could he speak of him without giving the honour that was due? If he believed that the Church of Rome was the authoritative "mother and mistress" of all the Churches, and that the bishop of Rome was the vicar of Christ, holding the place of God upon earth, could he inculcate the system of the faith, without noticing a point of such vast practical importance? Manifestly not. Therefore I must trouble you with a short extract from Lactantius, wherein he states the commencement of the Christian Church, and mentions Peter; but not in a manner at all suitable to the ideas which you hold at the present day.

After having discussed, at much length, the life, the character, and the death of Christ, and the conduct of the Jewish nation, Lactantius speaks of his resurrection, and of his conversing with his disciples forty days, and continues thus: [1] "These commands concerning the gospel and the preaching of his name, being given to his disciples, a cloud suddenly surrounded him, and bore him to heaven, on the fortieth day after his passion, as Daniel had predicted, saying: And behold in the clouds of heaven, the Son of man coming, went even to the Ancient of days. But his disciples being dispersed through the provinces, placed the foundations of the Church every where, doing great things in the name of their Lord God, and miracles almost incredible, because, in departing, he had endowed them with virtue and power by which the system of the new annunciation might be established and confirmed; and he also opened to them all future events, which Peter and Paul preached at Rome, and this preaching being written has remained as a memorial; in which, with many other wonderful things, they declared that this also should come to pass; that in a little time God should send a King who should make war upon the Jews, and should cast down their cities to the ground." &c.

[1] "Ordinata vero discipulis suis evangelica, ac nominis sui prædicatione, circumfudit se repente nubes, eumque in cœlum sustulit, quadragesimo post passionem die, sicut Daniel fore ostenderat, dicens: Et ecce in nubibus cœli ut Filius hominis veniens, usque ad vetustum dierum pervenit. Discipuli vero per provincias dispersi, fundamenta Ecclesiæ ubique posuerunt; facientes et ipsi nomine magistri Dei magna, et pene incredibilia miracula; quia discedens instruxerat eos virtute, ac potestate, qua posset novæ annuntiationis ratio fundari et confirmari: sed et futura aperuit illis omnia; quæ Petrus et Paulus Romæ prædicaverunt; et ea prædicatio in memoriam scripta permansit; in qua cum multa alia mira, tum etiam hoc futurum esse, dixerunt, ut post breve tempus immitteret Deus regem, qui expugnaret Judæos, et civitates eorum solo adæquaret." Lactant. de vera Sap. lib. iv. § 21. p. 277-8.

Here, you perceive, Lactantius passes briefly over the very ground where the supremacy of Peter and of Rome should prominently appear, if, in his day, these characters of your religion had been established in the catholic Church. But neither here nor elsewhere, does this writer intimate the slightest consciousness that these doctrines were an accredited part of the Christian system.

Eusebius, however, the bishop of Cesarea, is a much more important witness of the same kind. Several of his works have reached our time in excellent preservation, and his great work, especially, that which has obtained for him the title of Father of ecclesiastical history, furnishes the strongest circumstantial evidence against your doctrine of supremacy. Let us take a few extracts from his volumes, and see how the question stands.

From his commentary on the Psalms, I shall first present to you a passage which plainly gives Paul, instead of Peter, the leading place amongst the apostles.

Commenting on the text, where it is said: 'There is little Benjamin their ruler,' translated in your version according to the Vulgate, but not the Hebrew, 'Benjamin a youth in ecstasy of mind,'[1] (being the 28th verse of the 68th Psalm, numbered in your version the 67th,) Eusebius applies it to Paul, in which he agrees with the fathers generally, as your own note on the passage in the

[1] This being one of the places where our translation differs from yours, permit me to state for your satisfaction, that Jerome, and after him, Montanus, give the passage according to the Hebrew שם בנימן צעיר רדם, which Jerome translates *Ibi Benjamin parvulus continens eos*, and Montanus translates *Ibi Benjamin pusillus dominans eos*, both of which accord well with our version, but not at all with yours, which follows the Vulgate and the Septuagint. Eusebius cites the Septuagint, and also refers to the other versions, but his explanation of the passage would only be strengthened still more by the strict meaning of the Hebrew.

Doway Bible, correctly states:[1] "But for this word: There," saith Eusebius, "Symmachus says, Where is Benjamin the least or the younger: and Aquila likewise has it: There is Benjamin the less, ruling them. And this Benjamin the youngest or the least," continues Eusebius, "was Paul the divine apostle, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, as he himself teaches in these words: Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews. But he is called the younger, or the least, because he himself declares, I am the last of all, born out of due time. For this expression, however,

[1] ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ, ἐκεῖ, ὁ Σύμμαχος ὅπου φησι Βενιαμὶν ὁ μικρότατος, καὶ ὁ Ἀκύλας ὁμοίως, ἐκεῖ φησι Βενιαμὶν ὁ βραχὺς, ἐπικρατῶν αὐτῶν. Βενιαμὶν δὲ νεώτερος καὶ μικρότατος ἢ βραχύτατος, Παῦλος ἦν ὁ θεῖος ἀπόστολος, φυλῆς ὢν Βενιαμὶν, Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων, καθὼς αὐτὸς διδάσκει λέγων· περιτομὴ ὀκταήμερος, ἐκ γένους Ἰσραὴλ, φυλῆς Βενιαμὶν, Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων· νεώτερος δὲ εἴρηται ἢ μικρότατος, ἢ βραχὺς, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦτο διδάσκει λέγων· ὕστερον δὲ πάντων ὥσπερ τῷ ἐκτρώματι ὤφθη κἀμοί· ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ, ἐν ἐκστάσει, ὁ μὲν Ἀκύλας ἐπικρατῶν αὐτῶν· ὁ δὲ Θεοδοτίων παιδευτὴς αὐτῶν· ἡ δὲ ε' ἔκδοσις, παιδεύοντα ἢ διδάσκοντα ἡρμήνευσεν· οὐ δεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν πλειόνων λόγων εἰς ἀπόδειξιν τοῦ κρατεῖν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, καὶ παιδευτὴν αὐτῶν εἶναι τὸν ἱερὸν ἀπόστολον Βενιαμὶν ὠνομασμένον· οὐ μόνος δὲ ἄρα ὁ Βενιαμὶν ἦν ἐκεῖ δηλαδὴ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες Ἰούδα ἡγέμονες αὐτῶν, οἵ τε ἄρχοντες Ζαβουλὼν καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες Νεφθαλείμ· σημαίνει δὲ ὁ λόγος διὰ τούτων τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀποστόλοις, ὧν οἳ μὲν ἦσαν ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰούδα, οἳ δὲ ἐκ φυλῆς Ζαβουλὼν καὶ Νεφθαλείμ· διὰ τῆς τούτων μέμνηται χώρας τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγον· γῆ Ζαβουλὼν καὶ γῆ Νεφθαλείμ, ὁδὸν θαλάσσης πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν· καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Σωτὴρ παραγαγὼν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μαθητὰς ἔνθενδε ἀνεκαλεῖτο· σαφῶς οὖν ἐπικρατεῖν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, πρῶτον μὲν Παῦλον τὸν βραχύτατον καὶ μικρότατον καὶ νεώτατον τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐδίδαξεν ἐν ἐκστάσει ποτὲ γενόμενον, ὅτε ἐδίωκε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἐπόρθει αὐτὴν, ἢ ὅτε ἐν ἀποκαλύψει τὸν Σωτῆρα τεθέατο, ἢ ὅτε ἡρπάγη εἰς τὸν παράδεισον ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ· μετὰ δὲ τὸν Παῦλον, τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀποστόλοις ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ διαπρέπειν θεσπίζει, ἄρχοντας ὄντας ἡμετέρους ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰούδα καὶ ἄρχοντας Ζαβουλὼν καὶ ἄρχοντας Νεφθαλείμ. Euseb. Com. in Psalm. lxvii. § 28. p. 359.

In ecstasy of mind, Aquila translates: Governing them; Theodotion has it: Their schoolmaster, and in his fifth edition, *He explained discipline and doctrine.* Nor," continues Eusebius, "does it need many words to prove that the holy apostle, here called Benjamin, was the ruler and the preceptor of the Churches. Nor was he Benjamin alone there, that is, in the Churches of God, but also the princes of Judah their leaders, the princes of Zebulon, and the princes of Naphtali. By these are pointed out the rest of the apostles, of whom some were of the tribe of Juda, some of the tribe of Zebulon, and others of the tribe of Naphtali. Wherefore the Holy Spirit by Isaiah the prophet records the country of these, saying: The land of Zebulon and the land of Naphtali, the way of the sea across Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles. The Saviour accordingly, passing over by the sea of Galilee, called his disciples from thence. He teaches plainly, therefore, that Paul ruled first over the Churches, the lowest and least, and younger than the other apostles, placed sometimes in ecstacy of mind, when he persecuted the Church of God and wasted it, or when he saw the Saviour in a vision, or when he was taken up to Paradise even to the third heaven. But, after Paul, he prophesies that the other apostles would be fitly placed there, namely, in the Church, our princes of the tribe of Judah, and princes of Zebulon, and princes of Naphtali."

Now here is an express testimony to prove that the apostle Paul was the distinct subject of prophecy, the only one of the apostles so honoured, for the other twelve are spoken of in the plural, as the princes of Judah, and Zebulon, and Naphtali. Eusebius too, adopts all the versions in his commentary, and says that they were all fulfilled in Paul. He was the ruler in the churches, according to Aquila, the teacher according to Theodotion, and he might be truly said to have been in ecstasy of mind

according to the Septuagint and the Vulgate. But his conclusion is that "Paul ruled first over the Churches," and "after Paul the other apostles." I beseech you to say, brethren, whether Eusebius knew any thing of the principality of Peter when he wrote this passage. And if it were possible that you could find one like it in the writings of that early age, where Peter was the subject of an equal distinction; tell me whether you would not quote it triumphantly as conclusive on your side?

There is a casual expression of the same author, in his book on the Evangelical Preparation, where, being about to cite a text from St. Paul, he calls him: "[1] The holy apostle, and truly the first of all."

In his work entitled Evangelic Demonstration, he has a long disquisition shewing the humility and modesty of the several apostles, preferring each other before themselves, and yet faithfully recording all that is to their own disadvantage. Thus he states that Matthew is the only one of the evangelists who mentions the fact that he was a publican: that Peter, out of an excessive humility, did not think himself worthy to write a Gospel, and that the Gospel of St. Mark, written by Peter's companion and disciple, (and under his direction, as all the ancients held,) totally omits the famous address of Christ to him: Thou art Peter, and on this rock, &c. "For Mark," says Eusebius[2], "was not present at those things which were said by Christ, and Peter did not think it right to

[1] Πρῶτος γέ τοι πάντων ὁ ἱερὸς ἀπόστολος Παῦλος. Euseb. Præp. Evangel. lib. 1. cap. 3. p. 7. A.

Your own translator, Francis. Vigerus Rothomagensis, Societat. Jesu Presbyter, renders the above line thus: Quanquam omnium sane Princeps Paulus ille sacer Apostolus.

[2] οὐ γὰρ παρῆν ὁ Μάρκος τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ λεχθεῖσιν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Πέτρος τὰ πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ λεχθέντα τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐδικαίου δι' οἰκείας προφέρειν μαρτυρίας. Euseb. Demon. Evangel. lib. 3. cap. 7. p. 121.

tell those things which Jesus said to him concerning himself, by his own testimony." "But those things which concerned his denial of his Lord, he declared and published before all men: and there declares that he wept for it bitterly[1]." "We see, therefore," continues our author, "that the apostles refuse what might bring upon them a good reputation, while they commit to an eternal record, what might be charged against them[2]."

Now in this passage, it is easy to see how Eusebius regarded the point of Peter's supremacy. If the Saviour had been supposed by him to have conferred upon the apostle a high official pre-eminence, designed to be perpetuated to his successors in a particular Church to the end of the world, would Eusebius have praised St. Peter's modesty and humility in suppressing it? Was it not a sacred duty in St. Paul to *magnify his office*, while he abased himself? Do not all your bishops of Rome, the successors of St. Peter, in this very prerogative which you suppose granted by our Lord to Peter, continually claim their official rights as a matter of solemn obligation? And would a bishop of Rome be thought worthy of praise for his modesty or humility, in suppressing this distinction, and writing on the concerns of the Church as if he had it not? The answer to all this is plain and simple, and the conclusion is equally so. Eusebius, designing to shew the modesty and candour of the apostles in a strong point of view, declares that these things which were to their praise they mentioned not, but recorded all that could be brought in accusation against them. For an example, he instances Peter, leaving out

[1] *τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἄρνησιν αὐτοῦ εἰς πάντας ἐκήρυξεν ἀνθρώπους, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἔκλαυσιν ἐπ' αὐτῇ πικρῶς.* Ibid.

[2] *οἱ δὴ οὖν τὰ μὲν δόξαντα αὐτοῖς ἀγαθὴν φέρειν φήμην παραιτούμενοι, τὰς δὲ καθ' ἑαυτῶν διαβολὰς εἰς ἄληστον αἰῶνα καταγράφοντες.* Ibid. p. 122.

of Mark's Gospel (which was dictated by him) the whole of Christ's address to him on which you found the doctrine of the primacy: Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church, &c., while he records his own iniquity in denying his Saviour. The primacy for which you contend, is here opposed to the denial of the Saviour. If the one was personal to Peter only, so, in the opinion of Eusebius, must the other have been. But if the primacy was not simply personal, but official; and as much a part of the will of Christ as the call of Peter to be an apostle, and as necessary to be known and understood by the Christian Church for the sake of its unity, would Peter have presumed to suppress it in his communications to Mark? Would he have dared to omit it in his preaching? And would Eusebius have applauded an error which must have jeopardized, so far as Peter was concerned, the peace, if not the very existence of the catholic Church, according to your definition of it?

But the most decisive evidence on this point is furnished by the same author in his celebrated work, the Ecclesiastical History, in which he undertakes to give a narrative of the first three hundred and twenty years of the Church, from the time of Christ to the conversion of the emperor Constantine. In such a book, if any where, the doctrine of St. Peter's supremacy and the vicarious dominion of the Roman see over the rest of Christendom must have appeared continually, had Eusebius known of its existence. But it is not to be found; nay, nor any allusion to it, nor any appearance of it, during the annals of these primitive ages. On the contrary, there are many things recorded by this father of ecclesiastical history, which are plainly irreconcilable with your hypothesis, so that the testimony of this most important witness of the primitive Church, both negatively and circumstantially, is absolutely fatal to your claim.

Of this testimony—in order to exhibit itself fairly—I shall ask your attention, first, to his manner of speaking of Peter: secondly, to his manner of speaking of the bishops of Rome: thirdly, to his account of some ancient councils, which were held without adverting in any way to the authority of the bishops of Rome, and of the disputes concerning Easter, and baptism; and fourthly, to some letters of the emperor, distinctly shewing that there was no ecclesiastical difference between the authority of the bishop of Rome and that of the other bishops. I would gladly abbreviate, brethren, both for your sake and for mine, but the truth is worth all our labour, and we must not expect to find it without toil.

First, then, let us attend to the manner in which Eusebius speaks of Peter[1].

Quoting from Clement of Alexandria, our historian says, "Peter and James and John, after the ascension of our Saviour, though they had been preferred before the rest by our Lord, did not contend amongst themselves for the first degree of honour, but chose James the Just for bishop of Jerusalem." And again, "The Lord imparted the gift of knowledge to James the Just, to John and Peter after his resurrection." But at the close of the chapter (p. 50) mark how he speaks of Paul[2]: "In the mean while, Paul, that chosen vessel,

[1] Presuming that it might be generally more acceptable to you, I subjoin, instead of the original Greek of Eusebius, the Latin version of your own learned and celebrated Valesius. See Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Scriptores Græci, Ed. Amstel. tom. i. Euseb. Pamph. Ecc. Hist. Lib. 2. cap. 1. "Ait enim, (sc. Clem. Alex.) post Servatoris ascensum, Petrum, Jacobum, et Joannem, quamvis Dominus ipsos cæteris prætulisset, non idcirco de primo honoris gradu inter se contendisse, sed Jacobum cognomine Justum Hierosolymorum episcopum elegisse."——"Jacobo, inquit, Justo et Johanni et Petro Dominus resurrectionem scientiæ donum impertiit."

[2] Ibid. lib. 2. cap. 1. "Interea Paulus vas illud electionis, non ex hominibus nec per homines, sed per revelationem Jesu Christi, et Dei

not of men nor through men, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ himself and God the Father who raised him from the dead, is appointed an apostle, being called to that honour by a celestial vision and a voice addressed to him at the time of that manifestation." Here there is nothing to distinguish Peter, but much to indicate the opinion which Eusebius seems to have entertained, that Paul was the chief of the apostles.

Again, in the 14th chapter of the same book, (p. 64) Peter is spoken of with strong praise, where, recording the defeat of the magician Simon by this apostle, Eusebius says[1], that "Peter, the powerful and great apostle, who on account of his ability was the advocate of all the rest, was conducted to Rome against this pest of mankind." Here, it is manifest that Peter's supremacy would have been stated in your own way, or at least alluded to, if Eusebius had acknowledged such a doctrine. He would not have spoken of Peter as one, who, by his ability, was the advocate of the rest, but as one, who by his Lord's appointment *received authority* over the rest. The primacy which an advocate possesses by his skill in pleading a cause

Patris qui illum suscitavit a mortuis, Apostolus constituitur, cœlesti visione ac voce quæ tempore illius revelationis ad ipsum delata est, ad hunc honorem vocatus."

[1] Ibid. lib. 2. cap. 14. I regret to find an instance of unfaithfulness in Valesius' translation of this passage, altogether unworthy of him. The Greek is in these words: *πρόνοια τὸν καρτερὸν καὶ μέγαν τῶν ἀποστόλων, τὸν ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα τῶν λοιπῶν ἁπάντων προήγορον Πέτρον ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥώμην ὡς ἐπὶ τηλικοῦτον λυμεῶνα βίου χειραγωγεῖ.* And Valesius renders it: "Dei providentia fortissimum et maximum inter Apostolos Petrum et virtutis merito reliquorum omnium principem ac patronum Romam adversus illum generis humani labem et pestem perducit." Now here his zeal for Peter's supremacy has led him into an extraordinary amplification. Instead of the positive degree, powerful and great, according to the Greek, he has given us the superlative, *most powerful and greatest*; and instead of Peter's being the advocate or prolocutor of the Apostles, which is the proper meaning of the Greek *προήγορος*, he has called him *their prince and patron.*

for his clients, is a very different matter from the authoritative primacy which the judge exercises over the clients themselves. The first is the thing intimated by Eusebius; the second is that which your doctrine demands for Peter and his successors.

In the very next chapter, the historian relates the establishment of the Roman Church, and the writing of St. Mark's Gospel, in the following words[1]. "So greatly," saith he, "did the splendour of truth enlighten the minds of Peter's hearers, that it was not sufficient to hear but once, nor were they content to have received the doctrine of the divine word, by oral communication, without having it committed to writing; but they urgently besought Mark, the follower of Peter, whose Gospel remains to this day, that he would leave with them some written monument of what they had received. Nor did they cease their solicitations until they had prevailed with the man; and thus became the means of that history which is called the Gospel according to Mark." But Eusebius says nothing on the relation of the Church of Rome to the other Churches, nor on the subject of Peter's authority.

In the third book, chapter 1, the subject of Peter at Rome occurs again[2]. "The holy apostles and disciples

[1] Ibid. lib. 2. cap. 15. "Tantu sautem veritatis fulgor emicuit in mentibus eorum qui Petrum audierant, ut parum haberent semel audisse, nec contenti essent cœlestis verbi doctrinam viva voce, nullis traditam scriptis accepisse: sed Marcum Petri sectatorem, cujus hodieque extat Evangelium, enixe orarent ut doctrinæ illius quam auditu acceperant, scriptum aliquod monumentum apud se relinqueret. Nec prius destiterunt quam hominem expugnassent, auctoresque scribendi illius quod secundum Marcum dicitur, Evangelii extitissent."

[2] Ibid. lib. 3. cap. 1. "Apostoli et discipuli Domini ac Servatoris nostri per universum orbem dispersi Evangelium prædicabant. Et Thomas quidem, ut a majoribus traditum accepimus, Parthiam sortitus est: Andreas vero Scythiam, Joanni Asia obvenit, qui plurimum temporis in ea commoratus, Ephesi tandem diem obiit. At Petrus per Pontum,

of our Lord and Saviour," saith the historian, "being scattered over the whole world, preached the Gospel. And Thomas, as we have received it from our predecessors, was allotted to Parthia. Andrew went to Scythia, and John to Asia; where, after continuing for some time, he died at Ephesus. But Peter is supposed to have preached through Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia, to the Jews that were scattered abroad; who also, finally coming to Rome, was crucified with his head downward, having requested of himself to suffer in this way. But of Paul who can sufficiently speak, spreading the Gospel of Christ from Jerusalem to Illyricum, and finally suffering martyrdom at Rome, under Nero?" Here again, the historian gives no colour to your favourite doctrine, that Peter received authority over the other apostles, that he was the first bishop of Rome, and that his supremacy devolved on his successors.

So far, indeed, is Eusebius from countenancing this statement, that he expressly names Linus as the first Roman bishop[1]. "After the martyrdom of Paul and Peter," saith he, "Linus was the first that received the episcopate at Rome. Paul makes mention of him in his

Galatiam, Bithyniam, Cappadociam atque Asiam Judæis qui in dispersione erant, prædicasse existimatur. Qui ad extremum Romam veniens, cruci suffixus est capite deorsum demisso: sic enim ut in cruce collocaretur oraverat. De Paulo jam quid attinet dicere, qui a Hierosolymis usque ad Illyricum munus Evangelicæ prædicationis implevit, ac postremò Romæ sub Nerone martyrio perfunctus est."

[1] Ib. lib. 3. cap. 2. "Cæterum post Pauli Petrique martyrium primus Ecclesiæ Romanæ episcopatum suscepit Linus. Hujus mentionem facit Paulus in epistola quam ab urbe Roma ad Timotheum scripsit, inter salutationes quæ ad calcem epistolæ leguntur: Salutat te, inquit, Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, et Claudia." Valesius converts this unquestionable fact into a general observation, where in his annotations upon the 14th ch. of the same book, he says expressly, that the "Apostles were not reckoned in the number of the bishops." "*Apostoli vero extra ordinem erant, nec in Episcoporum numero censebantur.*"

epistle from Rome to Timothy, saying, Eubulus and Pudens, and Linus and Claudia, salute thee."

Here Eusebius accords with Irenæus in the important fact, that Linus, and not the apostle Peter, was the first bishop of Rome; thus opposing a positive negative to your doctrine.

His mode of speaking of the Church of Rome, seems to my mind altogether irreconcilable with your hypothesis. Thus in the 4th book, 16th chapter, he calls Rome simply "the great city[1]." And in the 6th book, 14th chapter, speaking of Origen, he says, that "he came to Rome, being desirous of seeing the very ancient Church of Rome[2]." Would he say no more than this, if he had been taught to believe that Rome was the mother and mistress of all the Churches? Such, however, is the constant style of the historian; for he gives no intimation, throughout his works, of any superior headship or authority existing in favour of the supposed see of Peter.

I come, in the second place, to show the mode in which Eusebius records the successions of the various bishops, in which you will find no mark of distinction in favour of Rome.

In book 4, chapter 4, he gives us an account of what the title to the chapter calls, "the bishops of Alexandria and Rome, under the same emperor."[3] "But in the

[1] Ibid. lib. 4. cap. 16. τῇ μεγάλῃ πόλει.

[2] Ibid. lib. 6. cap. 14. ἐρξάμενος τὴν ἀρχαιοτάτην Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίαν ἰδεῖν. Here again Valesius amplifies, rendering the words "*Romanam ecclesiam omnium antiquissimam*," whereas Eusebius does not say the "Roman Church, *the most ancient of all*," but, "the very ancient Church of the Romans."

[3] Ibid. lib. 4. cap. 4. "Qui sub eodem Imperatore Episcopi Romæ fuerint et Alexandriæ.

"Anno autem principatus Adriani tertio Alexander Romanæ urbis episcopus fato functus est, cum decem annos administrationis explesset. Cui successit Xystus. Eodem circiter tempore mortuo Primo anno episcopatus sui duodecimo, Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ sacerdotium suscepit Justus."

third year of the same reign," says he, "Alexander, bishop of Rome, died, having completed the tenth year of his ministration. Xystus was his successor, and about the same time, Primus dying, in the twelfth year of his episcopate, was succeeded by Justus in the Church of Alexandria."

Again, in chapter 10[1], we read as follows: "In the first year of Adrian's reign, Telesphorus departed this life, and was succeeded in the charge of the Roman Church by Hyginus."

And again, in chapter 19.[2] "It was in the eighth year of the reign of Verus, that Anicetus, who had held the episcopate of Rome for eleven years, was succeeded by Soter; but at Alexandria, Celadion, who had presided over the Church fourteen years, was succeeded by Agrippinus."

Immediately after this, Eusebius notices that[3] "Theophilus governed the episcopate of the Church of Antioch, the sixth in succession from the apostles: for Cornelius, the successor of Hero, had sat in the same Church in the fourth place from the apostles." In both these cases, the historian uses language quite as capable of

[1] Ibid. lib. 4. cap. 10. *τούτου δὲ ἐν ἔτει πρώτῳ* Τελεσφόρου *τὸν βίον ἐνδεκάτῳ τῆς λειτουργίας ἐνιαυτῷ μεταλλάξαντος,* Ὑγῖνος *τὸν κλῆρον τῆς* Ῥωμαίων *ἐπισκοπῆς παραλαμβάνει.* Here, again, is a little specimen of Valesius' propensity; for whereas Eusebius says that Hyginus took the lot of the episcopate of the Romans, Valesius makes it look as well as he can by calling it a *pontificate: Pontificatum Romanæ urbis sortitus est Hyginus.*

[2] Ibid. lib. 4. cap. 19. "Porro supradicto Imperatore jam octavum principatus annum agente, cum Anicetus Ecclesiæ Romanæ episcopatum undecim annis obtinuisset, Soter in ejus locum successit. Apud Alexandriam quoque cum Celadion per annos quatuordecim ecclesiæ præfuisset, Agrippinus sedem ejus obtinuit."

[3] Ibid. lib. 4. cap. 20. "Antiochenæ vero ecclesiæ episcopatum sextus ab Apostolis Theophilus gubernabat. Quippe Cornelius Heronis successor, quartus ab Apostolis eidem ecclesiæ præsederat.

bearing your interpretation as any that he uses in the case of Rome.

In the opening sentence of book the 5th, he states that [1] "Soter, bishop of Rome, died, having held the episcopate eight years. And Eleutherius, the twelfth from the apostles, succeeded in his place." And in chapter the 22d, he mentions, that [2] "in the tenth reign of Commodus, Eleutherius, who had held the episcopate for thirteen years, was succeeded by Victor."

Now these may serve as a specimen of the mode in which the father of ecclesiastical history speaks of the bishops of Rome and the Church of Rome. Nothing is here said of the apostolic see—the chair of Peter—the chief see—the mother and mistress of all the Churches—the vicar of Christ, or any other allusion or epithet which accords with the claims of your canon law. Indeed, the only episcopal seat to which Eusebius attaches any peculiarity, is that of Jerusalem. [3] For "James," saith he, book 7, chapter 19, "being the first that received the dignity of the episcopate at Jerusalem from our Saviour himself and the apostles, as the sacred Scriptures show that he was generally called the brother of Christ; this see, which has been preserved until the present times, has ever been held in great veneration by the brethren that have followed in the succession there."

But, in the third place, I am to notice what Eusebius

[1] Ibid. lib. 5. cap. 1. "Igitur Sotere Romanæ urbis episcopo post octavum episcopatus annum vita functo, duodecimus ab Apostolis Eleutherius in ejus locum successit."

[2] Ibid. lib. 5. cap. 22. "Interea Commodo decimum annum imperii agente, cum Eleutherius tredecim annis episcopatum administrasset, Victor in ejus locum successit."

[3] Ibid. lib. 7. cap. 19. "Sane et Jacobi illius cathedram, qui primus Hierosolymorum episcopus ab ipso Servatore et ab Apostolis est constitutus, et quem fratrem Domini cognominatum fuisse divina testantur volumina, ad nostra usque tempora conservatam, fratres illius ecclesiæ jam inde a majoribus magna prosequuntur reverentia."

says about the controversies concerning Easter, and the baptism of heretics, where the facts are utterly at war with your theory. The first of these subjects occurs in the 23d chapter of the 5th book, and is related in the following words.

[1] "There was a considerable discussion raised about this time," saith he, "on the following account. The Churches of all Asia, guided by a certain ancient tradition, supposed that they ought to keep the fourteenth day of the moon for the festival of the Saviour's passover, in which day the Jews were commanded to kill the paschal lamb; and thought it incumbent on them to make an end of the fast on this day, on whatever day of the week it should happen to fall. But it was not the custom to celebrate it in this manner in the Churches throughout the rest of the world, who observe the practice that

[1] Ibid. lib. 5. cap. 23. "Iisdem temporibus gravi controversia exorta, eo quod omnes per Asiam ecclesiæ vetusta quadam traditione nixæ quartadecima luna salutaris Paschæ festum diem celebrandum esse censebant, quo die præscriptum erat Judæis ut agnum immolarent: eaque omnino luna in quemcunque demum diem septimanæ incidisset, finem jejuniis imponendum esse statuebant: cum tamen reliquæ totius orbis ecclesiæ alio more uterentur, qui ex Apostolorum traditione profectus etiamnum servatur, ut scilicet non alio quam resurrectionis Dominicæ die jejunia solvi liceat: Synodi ob id, cœtusque episcoporum convenere. Atque omnes uno consensu ecclesiasticam regulam universis fidelibus per epistolas tradiderunt: ne videlicet ullo alio quam Dominico die mysterium resurrectionis Domini unquam celebretur: utque eo duntaxat die Paschalium jejuniorum terminum observemus. Exstat etiamnum epistola Sacerdotum, qui tunc in Palestina congregati sunt: quibus præsidebant Theophilus Cæsareæ Palestinæ, et Narcissus Hierosolymorum episcopus. Alia item exstat epistola Synodi Romanæ, cui Victoris episcopi nomen præfixum est. Habentur præterea literæ episcoporum Ponti, quibus Palma utpote antiquissimus præfuit. Epistola quoque ecclesiarum Galliæ exstat, quibus præerat Irenæus. Ecclesiarum quoque in Osdroënæ provincia et in urbibus regionis illius constitutarum literæ visuntur. Seorsum vero Bachylli Corinthorum Episcopi, aliorumque complurium epistolæ exstant; qui omnes eandem fidem eandemque doctrinam proferentes, unam edidere sententiam."

has prevailed from apostolic tradition until the present time, namely, that it was not lawful to terminate the fast on any other than the day of the resurrection of our Lord. Hence there were *synods and councils of the bishops* on this question; and all unanimously drew up an ecclesiastical decree, which they communicated by letter to the faithful in all places, that the mystery of our Lord's resurrection should be celebrated on no other day than the Lord's day, and that on this day alone we should observe the close of the paschal fasts. The epistle of the bishops who then assembled in Palestine, is still extant, over whom presided Theophilus, bishop of Cesarea, and Narcissus, bishop of Jerusalem. Another epistle of the Roman synod is also extant, to which the name of Victor the bishop is prefixed. There is an epistle also of the bishops of Pontus, over whom Palmas, as the most ancient, presided; also of the Churches of Gaul, over whom Irenæus presided. Moreover, one from those in the province of Osrhoëne, and the cities there. And a particular epistle from Bachyllus, bishop of the Corinthians; and epistles of many others, who, advancing the same faith and the same doctrine, also pronounced the same opinion."

[1] "Over the bishops, however, of Asia, who sharply contended that the custom handed down to them from their fathers, should be retained," continues Eusebius

[1] Ibid. lib. 5. cap. 24. "Episcopis vero Asiæ, qui morem sibi a majoribus traditum retinendum esse acriter contendebant, Polycrates præerat. Qui quidem in ea epistola quam ad Victorem et ad Romæ urbis ecclesiam scripsit, traditionem ad sua usque tempora propagatam exponit his verbis. Nos igitur verum ac genuinum agimus diem."—— "Possem etiam episcoporum qui mecum sunt, facere mentionem, quos petiistis ut convocarem, sicut et feci; quorum nomina si adscripsero, ingens numerus videbitur."—"His ita gestis, Victor quidem Romanæ urbis episcopus illico omnes Asiæ vicinarumque provinciarum ecclesias tamquam contraria rectæ fidei sentientes, a communione abscindere conatur; datisque literis universos qui illic erant fratres proscribit, et ab unitate ecclesiæ prorsus alienos esse pronuntiat. Verum hæc

in the following chapter, " Polycrates presided. He, indeed, had also set forth the tradition which had descended to his time, in a letter which he addressed to Victor and the Church of Rome. We, said he, observe the true and genuine day."——" I could also mention the bishops that were present, whom you requested that I might call together, which I did accordingly; whose names, did I write them, would appear a vast number." ——" Upon this, Victor, the bishop of the Roman city, forthwith endeavours to cut off from the communion all the Churches of Asia, and of the neighbouring provinces, as holding opinions contrary to the true faith. And he publishes abroad by letters, and proclaims, that all the brethren are wholly excommunicated. But these doings did not please all the bishops. They immediately exhorted him, on the contrary, to contemplate that course which was calculated to promote peace, unity, and love to one another."

" There are also extant," saith our historian, " their letters, in which they pressed upon Victor with great severity. Amongst the rest, Irenæus, in an epistle which he wrote in the name of the brethren over whom he presided in Gaul, defended indeed the opinion, that the mystery of our Saviour's resurrection should be celebrated only on the Lord's day. Nevertheless he admonishes Victor, in a becoming manner, not to cut off

non omnibus placebant episcopis. Proinde Victorem ex adverso hortati sunt, ut ea potius sentire vellet quæ paci et unitati caritatique erga proximum congruebant."

" Exstant etiamnum eorum literæ, quibus Victorem acerbius perstringunt. Ex quorum numero Irenæus in epistola quam scripsit nomine fratrum quibus præerat in Gallia, illud quidem defendit, solo die Dominico resurrectionis Domini mysterium esse celebrandum: Victorem tamen decenter admonet, ne integras Dei ecclesias morem sibi a majoribus traditum custodientes, a communione abscindat," &c.——" Nec vero ad Victorem solum, sed ad multos alios ecclesiarum antistites de quæstione proposita literas in eandem sententiam misit."

from communion whole Churches of God, who observed the tradition of an ancient custom." Here follows the extract which I have already quoted as a part of the testimony of Irenæus; and Eusebius concludes this chapter by saying, that "not only to Victor, but likewise to many of the other rulers of the Churches, Irenæus sent letters on the question proposed, expressing the same opinion."

Now in this long extract, there are several points of importance, all hostile to your claims. First, there are various councils held upon the question, over some of which Theophilus, bishop of Cesarea, and Narcissus, bishop of Jerusalem, are mentioned as presiding; but there is not one word of the bishop of Rome, as directing them, summoning them, or taking any part beyond that of his episcopal brethren.

But presently, Victor, the bishop of Rome, takes it upon him to request Polycrates, bishop of Samos, to summon a council and concur with the decision of the Western Churches; threatening him, too, as it seems by Polycrates' answer, with the consequences of refusal. Did Polycrates and his brethren regard this threat, or acknowledge any authority in Victor? Nay: although Victor had the unanimous decree of the Western Churches in support of his opinion. And when Victor, in pursuance of his threat, endeavoured to have the bishops of Asia cast out of the communion of the Western Churches, did he prevail? So far from it that Eusebius condemns him, and says that the bishops who agreed with the decree condemned him, and "pressed upon him with great severity." Where then, in all this, is the supremacy of Rome? Where stands the supposed dominion of Peter, and the authority of the mother and mistress of all the Churches? Surely, brethren, no candid mind can read the narrative without seeing, that the

primitive state of this matter could have been nothing like your system at the present day.

Again, in the account of the dispute about heretical baptisms, which was under review when the testimony of Cyprian was before us, Eusebius corresponds fully, stating the matter in such terms as are in accordance with the official equality of the bishops, but totally irreconcilable with your doctrine of supremacy. [1] "After Cornelius," saith he, (Book 7. chap. 2.) "had held the episcopal office at Rome about three years, he was succeeded by Lucius, but the latter did not hold the office quite eight months, when dying, he transferred it to Stephen. To this Stephen, Dionysius wrote the first of his epistles on baptism, as there was no little controversy at that time, whether those turning from any heresy whatever should be purified by baptism: for the ancient practice prevailed with regard to such, that they should only have imposition of hands with prayer."

[2] "Cyprian," continues the historian in the next chapter, "who then governed the Church of Carthage, was of opinion, that they should not be admitted unless they were first cleansed from their error by baptism. But Stephen, who thought that no innovations should be

[1] Ibid. lib. 7. cap. 2. "Interea Romæ cum Cornelius tribus circiter annis episcopatum tenuisset, Lucius in ejus locum substituitur; qui vix octo mensium spatio perfunctus eo munere, moriens episcopale officium Stephano dereliquit. Ad hunc Stephanum Dionysius primam earum quæ de Baptismo conscriptæ sunt epistolam exaravit, cum per id tempus non mediocris controversia exorta esset, utrum eos qui ex qualibet hæresi convertuntur, baptismo purgari oporteret. Quippe antiqua consuetudo invaluerat, ut in ejusmodi hominibus sola manuum impositio cum precationibus adhiberetur."

[2] Ibid. lib. 7. cap. 3. "Primus omnium Cyprianus qui tunc temporis Carthaginensem regebat ecclesiam, non nisi per baptismum ab errore prius emundatos, admittendos esse censuit. Verum Stephanus nihil adversus traditionem quæ jam inde ab ultimis temporibus obtinuerat innovandum ratus, gravissime id tulit."

made contrary to the tradition that had prevailed from ancient times, was much offended at this." Now, here, again, there is not a hint of your doctrine, although it is obvious that questions of authority and rights of official government are always brought prominently forward, when there is any thing like strife or contention.

The twenty-seventh chapter of the same book, presents to us another occasion of episcopal jurisdiction, when the heresy of Paul, the bishop of Antioch, rendered a council of bishops necessary to preserve the Church.[1] "The other pastors of the Churches," says Eusebius, "aroused from every quarter, met together at Antioch, as against a destroyer of the flock of Christ."—"Among these,[2] (chap. 18) the most eminent were Firmilianus, bishop of Cesarea in Cappadocia, Gregory and Athenodorus, brothers and bishops of the Churches in Pontus; also Helenus, bishop of the Church at Tarsus, and Nicomas, bishop of Iconium, besides Hymenæus, who ruled the Church at Jerusalem, and Theotecnus, who presided over the adjacent Church at Cesarea. Moreover Maximus, who governed the Church of Bostra with great celebrity. Six hundred others also assembled together with the presbyters and deacons, whose names it would not be difficult to recite. But those whom I have mentioned

[1] Ibid. lib. 7. cap. 27. "At reliqui ecclesiarum pastores undique exciti, tanquam adversus gregis Dominici vastatorem simul omnes Antiochiam convenerunt."

[2] Ibid. cap. 28. "Inter quos maxime eminebant Firmilianus Cæsareæ Cappadocum episcopus; Gregorius et Athenodorus fratres, ecclesiarum apud Pontum episcopi: Helenus quoque Tarsi, et Nicomas Iconii antistites. Sed et Hymenæus qui ecclesiam Hierosolymitanam regebat, et Theotecnus qui Cæsariensem illi finitimam administrabat. Maximus præterea, qui Bostrensem ecclesiam summa cum laude gubernavit. Sexcentos quoque alios qui una cum presbyteris et diaconis eo confluxerunt, nequaquam difficile fuerit recensere. Verum hi quos dixi, illustres præ cæteris habebantur."

were the most distinguished." [1] "In the reign of the emperor Aurelian a final council was convened, in which bishops almost innumerable were assembled, and Paul, the author of this nefarious heresy, was convicted at Antioch, and being plainly found guilty of false doctrine by all, was cast out from the whole catholic Church under heaven."——[2] "The bishops, therefore," continues Eusebius, "who had been convened, wrote an epistle, *by common consent*, to Dionysius, bishop of Rome, and to Maximus of Alexandria, and sent it to all the provinces. And here it may not be inexpedient to narrate their very words, as a perpetual memorial for posterity. *To Dionysius and Maximus, and to all our fellow-ministers throughout the world*, the bishops, presbyters, and deacons, and *to the whole Catholic Church under heaven:* Helenus and Hymenæus, Theophilus, Theotecnus, Maximus, Proculus, Nicomas, Ælianus, Paul, Bolanus, Protogenes, Hierax, Eutychius, Theodorus, Malchion, and Lucius, and all the rest who with us are bishops of the neighbouring cities and provinces, and the presbyters

[1] Ibid. lib. 7. cap. 29. "Hujus temporibus (sc. Aureliani) postrema Synodus innumerabilium fere episcoporum congregata est; in qua auctor ille nefariæ apud Antiochiam hæreseos Paulus, convictus et ab omnibus manifestissime deprehensus falsi dogmatis reus, ab universa quæ sub cœlo est ecclesia Catholica eliminatus est."

[2] Ibid. lib. 7. cap. 30. "Omnes itaque in unum congregati antistites, unam ex communi sententia ad Dionysium Romanæ urbis episcopum, et ad Maximum Alexandrinum scripserunt epistolam: eamque ad omnes deinde provincias transmiserunt.——Porro ipsamet illorum verba, ad perpetuam posterorum memoriam non incommodum fuerit hic referre.

"Dionysio et Maximo, et omnibus per universum orbem comministris nostris; episcopis, presbyteris, et diaconis; et universæ ecclesiæ catholicæ quæ sub cœlo est, Helenus et Hymenæus, Theophilus, Theotecnus, Maximus, Proculus, Nicomas, Ælianus, Paulus, Bolanus, Protogenes, Hierax, Eutychius, Theodorus et Malchion et Lucius, et reliqui omnes qui nobiscum sunt vicinarum urbium et provinciarum episcopi, presbyteri ac diaconi, et ecclesiæ Dei, carissimis fratribus in Domino salutem."

and the deacons, and the Churches of God, to the beloved brethren in the Lord, greeting." The epistle proceeds to set forth the heresy of Paul, and the various accusations against him, and concludes in these words: [1] "Since, then, we have rejected from our communion this man, proclaiming war against God, and unwilling to yield, we have found it necessary to ordain another bishop of the catholic Church in his place, not, as we believe, without divine providence: viz. Domnus, the son of Demetrianus, the bishop of blessed memory, and who, before this, presided with much honour over the same Church, a man adorned with all the qualities which become a bishop. We have accordingly communicated this to you, *that you may write to him, and receive letters of communion from him.*"——"Paul, therefore," proceeds the historian, "having thus fallen from the episcopate, as well as from the true faith, as already said, Domnus succeeded in the administration of the Church at Antioch. But Paul being unwilling to leave the ecclesiastical edifice, *an appeal was made to the emperor Aurelian*, who decided most equitably on the business, ordering the building to be given up to those whom the Italian bishops of the Christian religion, and the Roman bishop, should appoint. Thus, then, this man was driven out of the

[1] Ibid. "Hunc igitur, Deo bellum indicentem, nec cedere volentem, cum a communione nostra abdicassemus, necesse habuimus alium ejus loco ecclesiæ catholicæ episcopum ordinare, non absque divina ut credimus providentia. Demetriani scilicet, beatæ memoriæ episcopi, qui ante hunc magna cum laude eandem rexit ecclesiam, filium, Domnum; virum omnibus quæ episcopum decent dotibus exornatum: quod quidem idcirco vobis significavimus, ut ad eum scribatis, et ab eo communicatorias literas accipiatis."——"Igitur cum Paulus a recta fide simul et episcopatu excidisset, Domnus, ut dictum est, administrationem Antiochensis ecclesiæ suscepit. Sed cum Paulus e domo ecclesiæ nullatenus excedere vellet; interpellatus Imperator Aurelianus rectissime hoc negotium dijudicavit, iis domum tradi præcipiens, quibus Italici Christianæ religionis antis-

Church with extreme disgrace, by the temporal power itself."

Now here, brethren, I beseech you to observe the contrast between your present canon law and the primitive Church of Rome. The council of Antioch, though not reckoned a general council, was yet more than a common provincial one. The see of Antioch was of high importance, the heresy of Paul was of an aggravated character, and more than one council was holden before the matter was determined, and yet nothing is said about the bishop of Rome. What these bishops did, too, you perceive, was done on behalf of the whole catholic Church under heaven, because the excommunication of Paul is expressly thus stated; and the council proceed to appoint another bishop of the catholic Church in his place, and still nothing is said of the bishop of Rome.

In the next place, mark the caption of the epistle. It was addressed, says Eusebius, "by common consent," to the bishops of Rome and Alexandria; and by the epistle itself, we see that it was addressed also to all the clergy of the "whole catholic Church under heaven." And in the conclusion, where the council state the purpose for which they write, they do not refer to any act of the bishop of Rome being necessary to confirm their proceedings, but taking it for granted that they had as much authority as any other portion of the catholic Church, they communicate their acts in order that the bishops of Rome and Alexandria, and all the other bishops to whom their epistle was addressed, might write to Domnus, the newly-appointed bishop, and receive letters of communion from him. Where then was your present doctrine of

tites et Romanus episcopus scriberent. Hoc modo vir supra memoratus cum summo dedecore per sæcularem potestatem ab ecclesia exturbatus est."

supremacy, which makes the consent of the bishop of Rome necessary even to the decrees of a general council, and which expressly reserves to him, and that by divine right, the sole power of deposing and translating bishops? Can circumstantial evidence be stronger than this, where you have Eusebius, the father of ecclesiastical history, with all the fathers of the celebrated council of Antioch, acting and writing in a style at total variance with your modern system?

And yet there is one circumstance more, to cap the climax of proof in this matter. Paul was dissatisfied. There was an appeal—of course from the decision of the council: and appeals from the decision of the bishops, saith your canon law, must be to the bishop of Rome—the chief pontiff. But does the ecclesiastical record of the third century say so? Nay, brethren, for Eusebius expressly tells us that the appeal was made to the emperor. And the emperor referred the question to the decision, not of the bishop of Rome, but of the bishops of Italy and Rome; thus plainly giving the bishop of Rome only a voice among his episcopal brethren of Italy. How, I beseech you, would such an imperial decree harmonize with your present doctrine?

Perhaps, however, all this was wrong—irregular: perhaps the council of Antioch and the emperor Aurelian transgressed against the acknowledged prerogatives of the Church of Rome, and therefore no inference should be drawn from the transaction. Well, then, the bishop of Rome remonstrated, complained, rejected these schismatic doings, as was the bounden duty of the man who was the vicar of Christ, holding the place of God upon the earth, and having the authority of a shepherd over his flock in relation to the other bishops, according to the doctrine of your canon law and the Doway catechism.

But did he complain? Nay, brethren, he acquiesced. There is not a word intimating the slightest dissatisfaction, but the contrary. So that here we have the action of the council of Antioch, the condemnation of Paul, the ordination of Domnus, the epistle addressed to the catholic Church, the appeal to the emperor, the acquiescence of the Roman bishops, and the testimony of Eusebius, all concurring to demonstrate that the primitive Church of Rome knew nothing of the supremacy which you now claim over the Christian world.

I doubt not, brethren, that you are weary of this witness, and I would, for my own sake, as well as yours, that I might dismiss his testimony; but justice requires that I should extract from his pages the evidence of another celebrated name, Constantine, the Roman emperor, under whose zealous patronage the Church obtained a final victory over heathenism.

Eusebius has preserved, in his invaluable record, several of this emperor's epistles, of which two may suffice upon the point before us, and to these I beg your especial attention.

"*Copy of the emperor's epistles, in which he orders a council of bishops to be held at Rome for the unity and peace of the Church.*

[1] "Constantine Augustus, to Miltiades, bishop of Rome, and to Marcus. As many communications of this kind

[1] Ibid. lib. 10. cap. 5. "Exemplum epistolæ Constantini Imperatoris, qua episcoporum Concilium Romæ fieri jubet pro unitate et concordia ecclesiarum.

"Constantinus Augustus Miltiadi episcopo urbis Romæ et Marco. Quoniam hujusmodi plures libelli a viro clarissimo Anulino Africæ Proconsule ad me sunt missi, in quibus continetur Cæcilianum Carthaginensium urbis episcopum a quibusdam collegis suis per Africam constitutis multis de causis insimulari. Quod quidem permolestum mihi videtur, in istis provinciis quas divina providentia meæ devotioni spontanea deditione tradidit, et in quibus maxima est populi multitudo, plebem quasi in duas

have been sent to me from Anulinus, the most illustrious proconsul of Africa, in which it is stated that Cæcilianus, the bishop of Carthage, is accused, on many accounts, by his colleagues in Africa; and as it appears very grievous to me, that in those provinces which divine providence has entrusted to my devotion by his free-gift, and in which there is a vast population, the multitude are found inclining to deteriorate, and in a manner divided into two parties, and that even the bishops are at variance; I have resolved that the same Cæcilianus, together with ten bishops, who appear to accuse him, and ten others, whom he himself may consider necessary for his cause, shall sail to Rome; that before you, as also before Reticius, Maternus, and Marinus, your colleagues, whom I have commanded to hasten to Rome for this purpose, he may be heard, in such manner as you think most consistent with the divine law."

Here, it is evident, that the bishop of Rome is not addressed as a man who already held the office of appellate judge over the whole Church, but conjointly with Marcus, and merely as an equal amongst his colleagues. The complaints of the African bishops against Cæcilianus were not made to the supposed head of the Church, but to Anulinus the proconsul, and through him to the emperor. The authority to try the accused is conferred on the bishop of Rome by the imperial appointment, and not on him alone, but along with Marcus, Reticius, Maternus, and Marinus, bishops of Italy, the whole forming a council. To show still more distinctly,

partes divisam ad deteriora deflectere, et episcopos inter se dissentire. Placuit mihi ut idem Cæcilianus una cum decem episcopis qui accusare ipsum videntur, et cum decem aliis quos ipse ad suam causam necessarios esse judicaverit, Romam naviget; ut ibi coram vobis et coram Reticio, Materno, ac Marino collegis vestris, quos ea causa Romam properare jussi, possit audiri, quemadmodum sanctissimæ legi convenire optime nostis."

however, the true state of papal jurisdiction at this period, let me ask your attention to the next document, where you will find the emperor addressing the bishop of Syracuse on the same subject.

"*Copy of the epistle of the emperor Constantine, in which he commands another council to be held, for the purpose of removing all the dissension of the bishops.*

[1] "Constantine Augustus to Chrestus bishop of Syracuse. As certain persons, some time ago, perversely and wickedly began to dissent from our holy religion and from celestial virtue, and from the doctrine of the catholic Church, I being desirous of putting an end to their contention, ordered that certain bishops should be sent from Gaul, and that those who are divided into two parties, pertinaciously and obstinately contending with each other, should be summoned before them from Africa, the bishop of Rome being also present; that the cause of dissension might be settled by diligent examination in the presence of them all. But since it has happened that some, forgetful of their own salvation, and of the reverence due to our most holy faith, still continue their private quarrels, and are unwilling to conform to the

[1] Ibid. "Exemplum epistolæ Constantini Imperatoris, qua alteram episcoporum Synodum fieri jubet ut omnis episcoporum dissensio tollatur.

"Constantinus Augustus Chresto Syracusanorum Episcopo. Jam quidem antea cum nonnulli pravo ac perverso animo, a sancta religione cœlestique virtute et ab Ecclesiæ Catholicæ sententia dissidere cœpissent, hujusmodi eorum contentionem præcidere cupiens ita constitueram, ut missis e Gallia quibusdam episcopis, accitis etiam ex Africa iis qui duas in partes divisi, pertinaciter inter se atque obstinate contendunt; præsente quoque Romanæ urbis episcopo, id quod commotum fuisse videbatur, sub horum præsentia posset diligentissima examinatione componi. Sed quoniam nonnulli, ut fere fit, et propriæ salutis et venerationis quæ sanctissimæ fidei debetur obliti, privatas adhuc simultates prorogare non cessant; prolatæ jam sententiæ acquiescere nolentes"——"idcirco mihi sedulo providendum fuit, ut hæc quæ post depromptum judicium volun-

decision already pronounced,"——"it has appeared necessary to me to provide that these disputes which ought to have been voluntarily composed after the first sentence was pronounced, should at length be fully settled by the judgment of many."

"We have therefore commanded the bishops to meet together from various and almost innumerable places, in the city of Arles, before the Calends of August, and we have also thought proper to write to thee, that thou mayest take a public vehicle from the most illustrious Latronianus, corrector of Sicily, and have with thee two presbyters of thine own selecting, as also three servants to afford thee services on the way, and so meet them within the same day at the aforesaid place: that through thy firmness and the prudence and unanimity of the rest that assemble, this dispute, which has continued incessantly until the present time, in the midst of most disgraceful contentions, may be discussed, after hearing all the allegations of the contending parties, whom we have likewise commanded to be present; and thus the controversy be reduced, at length, to that observance of faith and fraternal concord, which ought to prevail."

In this epistle it appears, that the peace of the Church

taria assensione jam finita esse debuerant, nunc tandem multorum interventu finem possint accipere."

"Quoniam igitur plurimos ex diversis ac prope infinitis locis episcopos in urbem Arelatensem intra Calendas Augusti jussimus convenire; tibi quoque scribendum esse censuimus, ut accepto publico vehiculo a viro clarissimo Latroniano Correctore Siciliæ, adjunctis tibi duobus secundi ordinis quos tu eligendos putaveris, tribus item servulis qui in itinere vobis ministrare possint, intra eundem diem ad prædictum locum occurras: quo tum per tuam gravitatem, [the Greek word is στερρότητος, which signifies firmness,] tum per ceterorum in unum coëuntium unanimem concordemque solertiam, controversia hæc quæ per fœdissimam altercationem ad hoc usque temporis perduravit, auditis omnibus eorum qui nunc inter se dissident, quos etiam adesse jussimus, allegationibus, ad congruam religionis et fidei observantiam fraternamque concordiam tandem aliquando possit revocari."

had not been restored by the judgment of the bishops of Italy, including the bishop of Rome. The emperor, therefore, summons a large council, for the purpose of composing the dissension, and addresses Chrestus, the bishop of Syracuse, in a strain which would suit your doctrine admirably if it had been addressed to the Roman pontiff. For the former epistle was not addressed to the bishop of Rome alone, but to him and others. While here is an epistle addressed singly to the bishop of Syracuse, and anticipating the favorable result of the council, not only from the prudence and unanimity of the other bishops, but especially from his individual firmness. Here, then, you have—not a recurrence to Rome as a remedy after the judgment of other bishops had failed, but a recurrence to other bishops after the judgment of Italy and Rome had failed; and this by the authority of the Roman emperor, himself a Christian convert; and handed down to us as an interesting part of the annals of the primitive Church, by a contemporary bishop, the father of ecclesiastical history.

Now I beseech you, brethren, as men who love the truth, to contemplate these documents stedfastly, and see how perfectly inconsistent they are with the rights of the bishop and the see of Rome, as your Doway catechism and canon law set them forth at the present day. If, as you now allege, St. Peter was constituted "the head and pastor of the other apostles"—if those apostles, and through them the whole Church, "were built on him"—if "since the translation of St. Peter's chair from Antioch to Rome, the particular Roman Church has been head of all the Churches,"—if "the pope, by *the Lord's appointment*, is the successor of the blessed apostle Peter, and *holds the place of the Redeemer himself* upon the earth," bearing the authority, "not of a mere man, but of *the true God*"—if "Christ, the King of kings, and Lord of

lords, gave to the Roman pontiff, in the person of Peter, the plenitude of power,"—if "the greater causes of the Church, especially those which concern the articles of faith, are to be referred to the seat of Peter,"—if "to the holy Roman Church, as to the mother and head, all the greater causes of the Church may recur and receive their decision according to her sentence,"—if "the Roman Church, *by the appointment of our Lord*, is the MOTHER AND MISTRESS of all the faithful,"—if all this be so, as you insist, how is it that the celebrated Eusebius —one of the most learned men of his day, writing a book on the history of the Church for the first three hundred and twenty years of the Christian era, honoured by a place in your own canon law, placed on the list of saints, and called by yourselves the father of ecclesiastical history—how is it that this Eusebius knew nothing of this vast perogative—that he recorded nothing which at all resembles it; but, on the contrary, recorded so much which is totally irreconcilable with the doctrine?

How is it that Constantine, residing at Rome, and of course in the most direct channel of information as to the claims of her bishop, and surely not opposed to his just rights—how is it that Constantine knew nothing of the papal supremacy, but acted and wrote as if he had the whole authority to direct, and as if the bishops, assembled in council at his command, had the perfect right to determine?

How is it that all the bishops of Africa and Gaul, to whom the epistle of Constantine refers, knew nothing of this papal supremacy, and that of the two epistles which I have cited, that which Constantine addressed to Chrestus, bishop of Syracuse, looks more like the acknowledgment of a primacy, than the epistle addressed to the bishop of Rome?

And, lastly, how is it, that the eighth canon of this

very council of Arles, mentions the controversy between Stephen and Cyprian, without the slightest allusion to the authority of the Roman see, or to the official rights of her pope, against which, according to your present doctrine, Cyprian had sinned so grievously? For this is the language of the canon in question: [1] "With regard to the Africans, since they use their own rule of rebaptizing, the council declared, that if any heretic should come to the Church, they should examine him in the creed, and if they found that he had been baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, he should only receive the imposition of hands. But if being examined in the creed, he should not confess this Trinity, he ought to be baptized." Here, we have the independence of the African Church acknowledged distinctly. "*They use their own rule*," saith the council. But had they done wrong by using their own rule in opposition to pope Stephen—had he been justifiable in his high claim to their submission—should not we have had, in this canon, some reprehension of the African independence, and some assertion of the Roman authority—the more especially too, as the canon proceeds to decree, *for the future*, the same course which Stephen had advocated; viz. that if heretics had been baptized in the orthodox *form*, it should be held sufficient?

Brethren, I will not say that no honest mind, with these facts before it, can subscribe to the doctrine of your canon law, because I cannot tell to what extent an honest mind may be deluded. But as the evidence ap-

[1] Concil. Hardouin. tom. i. p. 264. "De Afris autem, quod propria sua lege utuntur ut rebaptizent, placuit ut ad ecclesiam si aliquis hæreticus venerit, interrogent eum symbolum; et si perviderint eum in Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto esse baptizatum, manus tantum ei imponatur. Quod si interrogatus symbolum, non responderit Trinitatem hanc, merito baptizetur."

pears to my understanding, I do say, that of all the claims which the world has yet witnessed, the claim which appeals to the testimony of the primitive Church in support of your doctrine of supremacy, presumes most strongly upon the ignorance of mankind.

CHAPTER XVI.

Brethren in Christ,

Having now arrived, in the order of chronology, to the celebrated council of Nice, which is generally considered by you as the first general council, it will be expedient to examine your sentiments on the subject of councils, with which is intimately connected your important claims to infallibility. I proceed, therefore, to state, from your Doway catechism and your canon law, all that seems necessary to a proper explanation of your present doctrine.

"The Church is infallible," saith your catechism (p. 24), "and is therefore to be believed; and all men may rest securely on her judgment. This is proved, First, because she is the pillar and ground of truth. (1 Tim. iii. 15.) Secondly, out of St. Matthew (xvi. 18), where Christ saith, 'Upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her.' Thirdly, out of St. John (xiv. 26), 'But the Paraclete,' saith he, 'the Holy Ghost, shall teach you all things, whatsoever I shall say to you.' And (xvi. 13), 'But when the Spirit of truth cometh, he shall teach you all truth.'"

Again, the same catechism declares, that "the definitions of a council perfectly œcumenical, that is, a general council, approved by the pope, are infallible in matters of faith; because, first, such a council is the Church

representative, and has the same infallibility that the Church spread over the world hath. Secondly, because the definitions of such a council are the dictates of the Holy Ghost according to that of the apostles, deciding in council: It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."

As the subject, however, is of such peculiar importance, let me ask your attention to the more systematic statement of your canon law.[1]

"*What is required to constitute a general council?*

RULE.

"In order that a council may be general, no other requisites are necessary than these:

1. That all the bishops should be called.

2. That it should be convoked by him who has the right to convoke it.

3. That he should preside in it, either by himself, or by some other.

A general council is nothing else than the whole Church congregated together."

§ 2.

"*To whom does the right belong, to convene and preside in a general council?*

RULE.

"According to the canons, it belongs to the pope alone to convoke and preside in a general council. Because a

[1] Expositio Juris Canon. Jo. Pet. Gibet. tom. i. p. 66.

§ 1. Quid requiratur ut concilium sit generale?

Regula.

Ut concilium sit generale non alia requiruntur, quam quæ sequuntur.

1. Ut omnes episcopi ad illud vocentur.

2. Ut convocetur ab eo, cujus est illud convocare.

3. Ut iste in eo præsit per se, vel per alium. Concilium generale non sit nisi ecclesia universalis congregata.

§ 2.

Cujus sit concilium generale convocare, eidemque præsidere?

council is the Church congregated together. But the Church is a body: and the pope is the head of this body. Therefore as in other bodies, it is the head that convokes, and presides in the convocation; it follows that it belongs to the pope to convoke and preside in a general council."

"This rule is subject only to the following exceptions: viz.

1. If it be doubtful who is the lawful pope.
2. If the pope be notoriously a heretic.
3. If the Roman see be vacant.
4. If a preceding council have fixed the time and place for a future one.

The decrees of the councils of Constance and Basle approve these four exceptions."

§ 3.

"*What is the authority of a general council?*

RULE.

"The authority of a general council is the same as the authority of the Church, and even of Holy Scripture.

"Because it represents the whole Church; and the same Holy Spirit who dictated the Holy Scriptures, also dictates its decrees."

"From hence it follows, 1st, that a general council

Regula.

Juxta canones corpore juris inclusos solius est papæ concilium generale convocare, eidemque præesse.

Ratio. Concilium, ut dictum, non est nisi Ecclesia congregata: Ecclesia autem est corpus: papa vero hujus corporis caput. Ideoque, sicut in aliis corporibus, capitis est corpus convocare, et convocato præesse, papæ est concilium generale convocare eidemque præesse. Præcedens regula non alias patitur exceptiones, quam istas.

1. Si dubius sit papa legitimus.
2. Si notorius sit hæreticus.
3. Si sedes vacat.
4. Si concilium præcedens futuri tempus et locum præfiniat.

Decreta concilii Constantiensis et Basileensis hæc quatuor probant.

can no more err from truth and justice, than the Church and the Holy Scripture; and therefore it cannot define or decree any thing contrary to faith or morals."

"2. That the authority of a general council must be the greatest, since it is the same with the authority of the Holy Spirit, who is God. And this by that double title by which the Holy Spirit governs it: namely, because it is the congregation of the spouse of the Holy Spirit, representing her entire, and because it is the interpreter of the revelation made by the Holy Spirit, whether contained in Scripture or in tradition."

"But you will say, If the authority of a general council is the same with that of the Holy Spirit, how is it

§ 3.

Quæ concilii generalis autoritas?

Regula.

Eadem est concilii generalis, ac Ecclesiæ, imo et Scripturæ Sanctæ autoritas.

Ratio: Ecclesiam totam repræsentat, ipsiusque definitiones dictat idem Spiritus Sanctus, qui Scripturam Sanctam dictavit.

Hinc sequitur, 1. non magis posse concilium generale a veritate et justitia deviare, quam Ecclesiam, et Scripturam sanctam: ideoque nihil posse contrarium fidei, vel bonis moribus definire, vel statuere.

2. Maximam esse concilii generalis autoritatem, cum eadem sit ac Spiritus Sancti, qui Deus est. Idque duplici titulo, quo illud regit Spiritus Sanctus; nempe prout est sponsæ Spiritus Sancti congregatio ipsam totam repræsentans, et prout est factæ a Spiritu Sancto revelationis, et in Scriptura, et traditione contentæ, interpres.

Dices: Si eadem sit concilii generalis autoritas, ac Spiritus Sancti, unde fit, ut præcepta ab eo facta non sunt divina, sed humana; ut patet ex eo, quod non obligant cum vitæ discrimine? Respondetur: Id provenire ex eo, quod concilium generale non sit Spiritus Sancti organum extra ea, quæ sunt revelata, illave, quæ fidem, vel bonos mores, proxime tangunt: idque, quia Ecclesia, quam repræsentat, constituta est tantum visibilis fidei morumque regula.

Dices iterum: Quomodo eadem est generalis concilii ac Scripturæ Sacræ autoritas, cum c. 4. de Elect. dicatur, a Romano pontifice autoritatem, roburque suum accipere; Scriptura autem sacra a Deo, non ab homine, suam accipiat autoritatem? Sed respondetur: Cap. oppositum ad rem non facere; quia, de rebus spectantibus disciplinam, loquitur, ac

that the precepts enjoined by it are not divine, but human, as appears from this, that they do not bind at the peril of life? It may be answered, Because a general council is not the organ of the Holy Spirit beyond those things which are revealed, or those which nearly affect faith and morals: and this is because the Church which it represents is only constituted to be the visible rule of faith and morals. You will say again, How should the authority of a general council, and that of the Holy Scriptures, be the same, when it is said in the canon (C. 4, de Elect.) that the council derives its force and authority from the Roman pontiff, whereas the Holy Scripture derives its authority, not from man, but from God? The answer however is, That the passage referred to does not concern this matter; because it speaks of what regards discipline, and the rule which compares the authority of a general council with the authority of Holy Scripture, applies to those things which concern faith and morals."

§ IV.

"*What is the distinction between general councils?*

RULE.

"The only distinction to be noted between general councils, is that which regards the constitutions about discipline, in which respect some have decreed purer constitutions than others."

hic comparatur generalis concilii autoritas cum Scripturæ autoritate, quoad res, quæ fidem moresque contingunt.

§ 4.

Quæ sit inter concilia generalia distinctio.

Regula.

Unica est inter concilia generalia notanda distinctio, quæ petitur ex constitutionibus circa disciplinam, quæque in eo sita est, quod alia aliis puriores ediderint.

Ratio: Duo tantum in conciliis generalibus considerari possunt. 1. Potestas definiendi et statuendi. 2. Definitiones et Constitutiones.

Quod

"The reason is as follows: Two things only are to be considered in general councils: 1. The power of defining and decreeing. 2. The definitions and decrees themselves."

"As to the first, there can be no distinction among general councils, because the power of the Church neither increases nor decreases; it has always remained and will always remain the same; for the modern Church is not less the spouse and the organ of the Holy Spirit, the body, whose head is Christ, the pillar and ground of truth, an army set in array, against which the gates of hell cannot prevail, with other similar expressions, than the primitive Church: the promises made to the Church are not affected by time."

"As to the second, there can be no distinction between general councils, if we refer to those definitions and constitutions which respect faith and morals: since, with regard to these, no definitions and decrees can be purer than the rest. It remains, therefore, that general councils cannot be distinguished, unless by reason of those constitutions which concern discipline——with regard to which, the constitutions of the earlier councils appear purer than the constitutions of the others."

"But you will say, that general councils are distin-

Quod primum, nulla potest esse inter ea distinctio: quia nec crevit nec decrevit Ecclesiæ potestas, eadem semper mansit, ut et manebit: moderna etenim Ecclesia non minus est sponsa et organum Spiritus Sancti, corpus, cujus caput est Christus, columna et firmamentum veritatis, castrorum acies ordinata, adversus quam portæ inferi prævalere nequeunt, aliaque similia, quam primitiva: promissiones Ecclesiæ factæ non sunt tempori obnoxiæ.

Quoad secundum, nulla etiam potest esse inter concilia generalia distinctio, si sermo sit de definitionibus, quæ fidem moresve respiciunt: cum circa illa, definitiones et constitutiones nequeant esse aliæ aliis puriores. Restat ergo ut concilia generalia non distinguantur, nisi ratione constitutionum, circa disciplinam——circa quam priorum conciliorum constitutiones cæterorum constitutionibus videntur puriores.

guished from each other, as respects their authority and their dignity, and you will produce as proof for this, the canon law, (c. 28. Dist. L.) in which it is said: Whenever the decrees of councils, are discordant, the authority of the stronger and more ancient, is to be preferred."

"It may be answered, however, 1. that this canon speaks of particular councils, for it would reconcile the council of Ancyra, which was provincial, with another particular council: 2. Although it did speak of general councils, it may be construed with regard to matters of discipline, in which the more ancient councils are preferable to the others; because devotion was fervent in the first ages, but grew cold in succeeding times, and on this account the earlier councils are held in greater honor, according to the saying: The fathers established reverence for antiquity."

§ v.

"*In what respects a general council differs from a particular one.*

RULE.

"The principal differences between a general and a particular council, are the following:

Dices: concilia generalia, quoad autoritatem, et dignitatem, distingui inter se, afferesque ad hoc C. 28. Dist. L. in quo hæc leguntur: *Quoties conciliorum discors est sententia, illius magis tenenda est cujus antiquior et potior est autoritas.*

Respondetur: 1. Illum canonem loqui de conciliis non generalibus: conciliat enim concilium *Ancyranum*, quod est provinciale, cum alio concilio particulari; 2. Etsi loqueretur de conciliis generalibus, restringi posset ad res disciplinæ, in quibus antiquiora concilia sunt aliis præferenda: quia, quæ prioribus sæculis fervebat devotio, succedentibus temporibus tepuit, et propterea majori in honore habentur: juxta illud: Antiquitati patres sanxerunt reverentiam.

§ 5.

In quibus concilium generale, a particulari præcipue differat.

Regula.

Præcipua inter concilium generale et particulare discrimina non alia sunt, quam quæ sequuntur.

"1. The pope alone can convoke a general council, and preside in it, but the right of convoking the others (sc. particular councils) and of presiding in them, belongs to other bishops.

"2. General councils are not subject to error nor to sin; but particular councils are subject to both.

"3. General councils bind the whole Church; but particular councils only bind the part represented.

"5. The judgment of general councils upon matters of law is infallible, but contrariwise of their judgment on other things."

These extracts may suffice to shew your present doctrine on the points of the authority of the pope and of a general council, together with the claim of infallibility connected therewith. And now, brethren, I shall undertake to prove, by the acknowledged records of the first general council, taken from your own writers, that every important item of your theory is a change from your primitive system.

For 1. Your canon.law requires that a general council be called by him who has "the right to call it," the pope alone. But the council of Nice was convoked by the emperor.

2. Your canon requires that the pope should preside in the council, either by himself or by some other.

But in the council of Nice he did not preside, either by himself or by any other.

1. Solus papa potest concilium generale convocare, in eoque præsidere; jus vero alia convocandi in iisque præsidendi ad alios pertinet.

2. Generalia concilia non sunt errori, nec peccato obnoxia; particularia vero, utrique.

3. Generalia obligant totam Ecclesiam; particularia vero, ex se ipsis, non ligant, nisi illius partem.

5. Judicium conciliorum generalium circa jus, est irreformabile; secus de aliorum judicio.

3. Your canon declares that the authority of a general council is the same with that of Holy Scripture and of the Holy Spirit; applying to its decrees the words of the apostles: "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."

But the council of Nice adopted no such style of expression: neither did it decree any thing concerning faith except as an inference from Holy Scripture.

Nor did it claim infallibility; nor did the fathers of that age ascribe infallibility to it.

Nor are its decrees observed by you at this day.

4. Your canon attempts to distinguish between the authority of councils with respect to faith and morals, and their authority with respect to discipline. But the council of Nice used the same phraseology for both, neither is there any ground for the distinction, in Scripture or in reason. Hence the fathers of that age do not defend the Nicene creed, by the presumed infallibility of the council, but by Scripture; so that the word of God was with them the decisive test, and not the theory of infallibility. The true origin, therefore, of this your favourite distinction seems to have been, that the decrees on faith, being esteemed sound interpretations of the Scriptures, grew into authority as such; while the decrees on discipline, not being founded on Scripture, but only resting on the recommendation of the council, were observed or not observed, as the Church thought proper. Patience and perseverance, brethren, are necessary auxiliaries in the argument before us. May He who is the fountain of light bestow them on the writer and the reader; and along with them, grant us that sincere and candid spirit, which is essential to every lover of truth.

CHAPTER XVII.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

THE two first subjects presented by the plan of the preceding chapter, respect the person who called and presided over the council of Nice.

In consistency with the requisitions of your canon law, you assert that [1] "Constantine the emperor, in order that he might succour the Church in her difficulties, *by the authority of Sylvester, the chief pontiff*, and according to the opinion of the other bishops, summoned bishops from every part of the world to Nicea, a city of Bithynia."

And again, you state the presidency over the council in these terms: [2] "Among the assembled bishops, the chief, as leader of the whole host, were Hosius, bishop of Cordova, Vitus and Vincentius, *who were sent by the blessed Sylvester, that they might preside over the council as legates of the apostolic see*, and Alexander, bishop of Alexandria."

[1] "Constantinus imperator ut laboranti subveniret ecclesiæ, Silvestri summi pontificis auctoritate, aliorumque sacerdotum sententia, ex universis orbis terrarum partibus episcopos in Nicæam Bithyniæ urbem, ad lacum Ascanium ab Antigono conditam, honorificentissimis literis accersivit." Mansi Concil. tom. ii. p. 637.

[2] "Inter hos primas obtinebant, ut totius agminis ductores, Osius episcopus Cordubensis, Vitus et Vincentius, qui a beato Silvestro missi, ut apostolicæ sedis legati synodo præerant, et Alexander Alexandrinus." Ibid.

These statements are the work, as you are aware, brethren, of no cotemporary writer. The records which you have handed down to us give not the slightest warrant for them, but rather, as I shall now proceed to show, contradict them altogether.

And first, as to the authority by which the council was summoned, I presume you will agree that there can be no better witness than the emperor himself, whose address at the opening of the council makes a part of its history. Let us cite it entire from your own version.

[1] "*The Oration of the Emperor Constantine to the Nicene council, on peace.*

"Inasmuch as I have so greatly longed, beloved friends, to avail myself of this your licence, I acknowledge that I ought to render thanks to God, the King and Governor of all, that he has bestowed upon me this peculiar favour, the beholding you at length convened together in one, and about to manifest, as I trust, an unanimous agreement. Do not, therefore, suffer any storm of hatred, hostile to our prosperity, to drive this good away: and, since the warfare undertaken by tyrants against God has been terminated through His divine power, let not the lost fiend cast down the sacred discipline and religion of

[1] "Constantini Imper. oratio ad Concilium Nicænum de pace.

"Quoniam mihi admodum in optatis fuit, amici carissimi, isto vestro concessu aliquando frui; jam eo potius, regi et moderatori omnium Deo ideo gratias me agere debere fateor, quod mihi præter alia omnia largitus est, ut istud quod omnibus bonis antecellit, nempe vos in unum convocatos, unamque omnes et consentientem habituros voluntatem oculis tandem aspiciam. Nolite igitur pati ut ulla invidiæ tempestas, nostris rebus prosperis inimica, istud bonum labefactet; neque cum tyrannorum dimicatio contra Deum suscepta, jam Dei virtute profligata sit, ut denuo perditus dæmon divinam Christi disciplinam et religionem, malevolorum obtrectationibus lacerandam objiciat; quandoquidem intestina seditio in ecclesia Dei conflata multo plus molestiarum et acerbitatis, quam quodvis

Christ, to be torn by the malevolent opposition of the wicked. For intestine sedition excited in the Church seems to me to include within itself far more of trouble and acrimony than any secular strife, and these are far more prolific of grief than any external calamity. Since, then, through the help and decree of the all-good and powerful God, I have gained the victory over my enemies, I should think nothing more left to me, than that I should manifest my gratitude to God, and that, together with those for whom, by the aid of God, I have obtained liberty, I should sympathize in the common joy. As soon, therefore, as the tidings of your dissension reached my ears, I did not neglect the unwelcome rumour; *but mainly desirous that through my labour and care a remedy might be found, I summoned you all without delay.* And now, although I rejoice exceedingly in beholding your assembly, yet, nevertheless, I think it becomes me *chiefly so to order matters by the expression of my sentiments*, that I may see you all bound together by the conjunction of your minds, and that one common and peaceful agreement may grow and flourish amongst you, which, indeed, it is right for

bellum pugnave, videtur mihi in se complecti: atque hæc longe plus, quam externa, doloris afferre videntur. Cum igitur Dei optimi maximi nutu et auxilio adjutus, victoriam ab hostibus reportassem, nihilque amplius mihi reliquum putarem, quam ut tum Deo gratias agerem, tum una cum his qui, Deo opem ferente, per me essent in libertatem vindicati, communem lætitiam animo perspicerem: ut primum dissensio vestra ad aures meas præter omnem spem pervenit, rumorem illum de ea allatum non plane neglexi; sed optans in primis, ut huic rei mea opera et sedulitat remedium inveniretur, omnes vos absque mora accersivi. Ac tametsi lætor equidem vehementer, cum jam vestrum consessum intueor; tunc tamen arbitror me res maxime ex animi sententia gesturum, ubi omnes vos animorum conjunctione colligatos, et unam eamque communem inter omnes, et tranquillam concordiam (quam quidem vos, cum sitis Deo consecrati, aliis etiam a Deo impetrare consentaneum est) vigere florereque intellexero. Itaque ne ulla sit, quæso, in vobis mora, O carissimi, ac ministri, bonique famuli Dei, et communis omnium nostrum Domini et Salvatoris; ne gravemini, inquam, deinceps causas dissensionis inter vos

you, since you are consecrated to God, and also for others, to make the subject of earnest petition to the Deity. Therefore, I pray you that there be no delay on your part, beloved servants, and good ministers of God and of the common Lord and Saviour of us all; neither burden yourselves, I say, thenceforth, by bringing forward the causes of the dissension which has been raging amongst you; but first of all things give your labour, in order that every chain by which controversy has been upheld may be dissolved by the laws of peace. For thus you will perform a work acceptable to God the supreme Governor, and bestow upon me, your fellow-servant, the greatest favour."

How, brethren, I beseech you, does this accord with your assertion, that Constantine summoned the council by the authority of Silvester, the bishop of Rome? The emperor expressly takes to himself the whole matter, both in its design and in its execution. "I did not neglect the rumour of your dissension," saith he, "but being chiefly desirous that THROUGH MY LABOUR AND CARE A REMEDY MIGHT BE DISCOVERED, I SUMMONED YOU ALL WITHOUT DELAY." Where is Silvester, the pope at that time, mentioned in this address of Constantine? NOWHERE! Yet you imagine that the pope was the principal, and the emperor only his agent. Yea, you imagine that the right to summon a general council belongs to the pope alone, and that this is a right descending to him from St. Peter, having its origin in the grant of Christ himself. And yet, in truth, there is no evidence that the apostle Peter ever called a general council; nor did any bishop of Rome contemplate such a measure, until long

grassantis jam in medium afferre: primoque omnium operam detis, ut omnia vincula, quibus constricta tenetur controversia, pacis legibus omnino dissolvantur. Sic enim estis et Deo omnium gubernatori gratum facturi, et mihi vestro conservo maximum præstaturi beneficium." Mansi Concil. tom. ii. p. 662.

after the period of the council of Nice. The apostolic council of which we have the history in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts, does not appear to have been convened by the authority of any one apostle: we are only told "that the apostles and ancients (elders) came together to consider of this matter." The sentence of the council was adopted on the suggestion of James, the bishop of Jerusalem, "Men and brethren," saith he, (ver. 13,) "hear me," and in verse 19, he concludes by saying, "Wherefore, I judge," &c. "And it pleased the apostles and ancients, with the whole Church," (ver. 22,) to decree accordingly, and the letter sent to the Gentiles was written in the name of all the apostles, without distinction or difference. As to the case narrated in the twenty-first chapter, which some of your writers also call a council, it is still less to your purpose, for none of the apostles are mentioned but James. "Paul went in with us to James, and all the ancients were assembled." (ver. 18.) From that time until the conversion of Constantine, there is not the slightest trace of an attempt to summon a general council. Particular councils were holden on many occasions; and some of them, as that holden at Antioch on account of Paul of Samosata, were of great extent and importance: but with this last, I have already shown, from Eusebius, that the pope had no concern. The council of Arles, to which great respect is due, was summoned by Constantine; and you do not claim any jurisdiction for the pope on that occasion: so that the first instance of what you rightly call a general council occurred more than three centuries after the commencement of the Christian era; and that council is expressly stated, by the emperor himself, to have been a remedy devised by his own care for the Church; in perfect consistency with which we find him exhorting the bishops in person, without even mentioning the pope, or in any

way alluding to him. Can any candid mind ask for more conclusive evidence to disprove your present doctrine, and to demonstrate the proposition, that the primitive Church of Rome held no such sentiments upon the right of summoning a general council, as her successor advanced at a subsequent day?

An answer to the address of Constantine, however, was delivered, as a proper token of respect on the part of the council of Nice, by Eustathius, the bishop of Antioch. And you might expect that this would supply the omissions and gently insinuate the mistake of the emperor, in passing over, so strangely, the paramount authority of the bishop of Rome. But you will find in it, brethren, nothing of the kind, as I shall show by giving it entire, in the following extract:

[1] "We render thanks to God, most excellent emperor, who has committed to you the kingdom of the world, who by you has abolished the error of idolatry, and established tranquillity in the minds of the faithful. The stench of demons has ceased: that false religion, the worshipping a multitude of gods, is dissolved: the shadows of infidelity are driven away, the whole world is enlightened by the rays of divine knowledge. The Father is glorified, the Son is adored together with him, the Holy Spirit is announced, the consubstantial Trinity, one Deity in three persons and hypostases, is preached.

[1] "Deo agimus gratias, O optime imperator, qui terrarum tibi regnum dirigit, qui errorem simulacrorum per te abolevit, et in fidelium animis tranquillitatem collocavit. Cessavit nidor dæmonum: multiplicis deorum cultus soluta est falsa religio; expelluntur tenebræ impietatis, luce divinæ cognitionis orbis terrarum illustratur. Pater glorificatur, Filius simul adoratur, Spiritus sanctus annunciatur, Trinitas consubstantialis, una divinitas in tribus personis et hypostasibus, prædicatur. Per eum, O imperator, tibi munitur tuæ pietatis potentia. Eam nobis serva integram et inviolatam. Nullus hæreticus subiens Ecclesiam de Trinitate unum aliquid auferat, reliquum quod restat affectum ignominia. Arius nobis,

Through him, O emperor, the power of your piety is fortified. Preserve it for our sake, whole and inviolate. Let no heretic, invading the Church, take away aught from the Trinity, degrading thereby what remains. Arius, who derives his name from madness, is the cause of our speech and of our assembly: who being allured, I know not how, to the presbyterate of the Church of Alexandria, concealed from us that he was an alien from the doctrine of the blessed apostles and prophets. For he does not fear to deprive the only begotten Son and Word of the Father, of the same equal substance with the Father, and this worshipper of the creature contends that the creature should be numbered with the Creator. But you will persuade him, O emperor, that his judgment should be changed, that he may no longer oppose the apostolic doctrine; or if he should persist in the impiety of the vain opinion, of which he is already convicted, you will take him utterly away from the fellowship of Christ, and from ours, lest by the impure flattery of his words he should poison the souls of the simple."

Now I confess that these documents carry with them, to my mind, the clearest evidence against the primitive antiquity of your present doctrines. For manifest it seems to me, that if the Church of Rome, in the days of Constantine, had claimed a supremacy, and if the catholic Church had then understood and allowed this claim as

qui a furore accepit denominationem, orationis causa est et conventus: qui nescio quomodo allectus in presbyteratum Ecclesiæ Alexandrinæ nos latuit, cum esset alienus a doctrina beatorum apostolorum et prophetarum. Unigenitum enim Filium et Verbum Patris non veretur privare eadem et æquali cum Patre substantia, et Creatorem cum creatura creaturæ cultor contendit connumerare. Eum autem persuaseris, imperator, mutata sententia, non repugnare doctrinæ apostolicæ; aut si vanæ opinionis, cujus est convictus, perstiterit in impietate, eum de Christi et nostro cœtu funditus sustuleris, ne suis turbidis verborum blanditiis venetur animas simpliciorum." Ibid. p. 663.

you suppose, the emperor could never have made the address which I have cited, nor could the council of Nice, by their organ Eustathius, have tacitly allowed its truth. Only imagine, brethren, I beseech you, a modern sovereign belonging to your communion, acting and speaking like Constantine, summoning a council from every part of Christendom; telling this council, when assembled, that *he*, IN HIS CARE, had devised this remedy for the troubles of the Church; and finishing his oration without once adverting to the pope in any way whatever. Imagine an answer to such a speech by one of your bishops in the name of all the rest, in which this imperial assumption is allowed, and thanks given to God for it; while not a syllable is found to recognize the being or the authority of the vicar of Christ, the bishop of bishops. What would you say of such an address and such an answer? Could they, by any stretch of fancy, be attributed to a modern assembly such as the council of Trent? And can they be honestly reconciled with the idea, that pope Silvester, and the emperor Constantine, and the fathers of the Nicene council, had any conception of those claims of the papacy, which you now require us to acknowledge at the peril of our souls!

No further proof seems necessary for my first assertion, that the council of Nice was not convoked by the pope; but nevertheless it may be as well to add the express admission of your own canonist Gibert, who extends the remark to many other of the early councils.

[1] "As to the convocation of general councils," saith this writer, "the eastern and the western differ greatly. In this respect, namely, that the former were convoked by

[1] "Circa convocationem conciliorum generalium, orientalia multum ab occidentalibus discrepant. Scilicet in eo, quod priora singula, ab imperatoribus convocata fuerint, posteriora vero a pontificibus, excepto Pisano, a cardinalibus convocata. Facile probatur utrumque factum. Et qui-

the emperors, but the latter by the popes, except indeed, the council of Pisa, which was called by the cardinals. The proof is easily adduced. Thus the emperor Constantine in his first address to the Nicene council, *expressly declares, that he had convoked it.* So the first council of Constantinople in their epistle to Theodosius, in which they give him thanks, and render an account of what they had done, declare that they had been summoned together at his command. The same thing is asserted in the title to the canons of this council."

"In the council of Ephesus, manifold is the proof that it was convened by the emperors Theodosius and Valentinian. It is expressly declared in the exordium of the council, that it was held by the decree of the most religious and Christian emperors. The same is repeated in the beginning of all its sessions."

"The care which the council of Ephesus manifests, in proving that it was convoked by the emperors Theodosius and Valentinian, was imitated by the council of Chalcedon; for in the beginning of all its acts, it makes express mention of the command of the emperors Valentinian and Marcian, by whom it was convoked. It does the same in the title of the epistles which it wrote to those emperors, or to the empress Pulcheria."

dem imperator Constantinus in prima sua ad synodum Nicænam oratione, expresse dicit, se illam convocavisse. Primum concilium Constantinopolitanum in sua ad Theodosium epistola, qua ipsi gratias agit, rationemque gestorum a se reddit, declarat, se ipsius jussu congregatum fuisse. Idem dicitur in inscriptione canonum ejus."

"In concilio Ephesino multiplex occurrit probatio, illud ab Impp. Theodosio et Valentiniano coactum fuisse. Illud in exordio concilii expresse dicitur, ex Decreto Religiosissimorum et Christianissimorum Imperatorum. Idem repetitur in principio uniuscujusque actionis."

"Curam, quam concilium Ephesinum crebro indicat, se ab Imperatoribus Theodosio et Valentiniano convocatum fuisse, imitata est synodus Calcedonensis; namque, in principio singularum actionum, quæ sunt xv. numero, jussionis Impp. Valentiniani et Marciani, a quibus convocata

"St. Leo asks Theodosius, that he would grant a general council to Italy. And many rescripts of the emperors follow, which teach that the calling and the translation of general councils belonged to their office. What we have observed of the convocation of the four first general councils, is confirmed by the letter of the emperor Justinian to the bishops assembled at Constantinople by his command; for in order that he might defend his convocation of this council by the example of his predecessors, he relates on what account they had convoked the preceding councils."

Here, then, brethren, the first part of my argument is surely established, beyond the possibility of fair objection. Your canon law lays down as a primary requisite of a general council, that it be summoned by him who alone "has the right to call it," viz. the pope.

But I have proved that the first general council was not summoned by the pope, but by the emperor; and your own canonist declares the same remark to be applicable to all the four first general councils, and to many others. Hence, your primitive system has been changed in this important particular, and your canon law now ties the definition of a general council to a restriction which the primitive Church never knew.

2. The second point in which I am to prove your inno-

fuerat, expressam mentionem facit; similemque facit in epistolarum inscriptione, qua ad eosdem imperatores vel ad Pulcheriam imperatricem scripsit."

"S. Leo Theodosium rogat, ut Italiæ concilium universale largiatur. Sequuntur plura imperatorum rescripta, quæ docent, ad eorum officium pertinere conciliorum convocationem, ac translationem. Quod de quatuor priorum conciliorum generalium convocatione observatum fuit, confirmatur per epistolam Justiniani imperatoris, ad episcopos Constantinopoli ex ipsius jussu congregatos; ut enim convocationem hujus concilii a se factam suorum prædecessorum exemplo tueretur, refert, qua ratione concilia præcedentia convocaverint." Expos. Jur. Canon. tom. i. p. 77.

vation upon your own ancient doctrines, is that which concerns the presidency of a general council. For your canon law requires, as essential to a general council, that the pope shall not only summon it, but also preside over it, either in person or by proxy. But in the council of Nice he did not preside, either in person or by proxy. And this I shall next proceed to show.

[1] "As to the presidency of the council of Nice," says your own Gibert, "it is commonly accorded to Hosius, the bishop of Cordova, but it is disputed by what title; some saying that he possessed this honour, as being the legate of the apostolic see; BUT THERE IS NOT A VESTIGE OF THIS LEGATION. Others think that this was done on account of his singular virtue, knowledge, and experience; together with his old age, which attracted towards him great veneration. If confidence may be placed in the subscriptions of this council which are read in the councils, &c. it might be concluded that the bishops sat in it *according to the order of their respective provinces.*"

Here is a learned canonist from among yourselves, brethren, plainly acknowledging that the assertion by which you sustain the claim of the pope to the presidency of the Nicene council, is without a vestige of proof. Nor is this the only instance in which councils were held in the same manner; for I shall cite some other passages from the same high authority, to show that the pope did

[1] "Quoad præsidentiam in concilio Nicæno, vulgo hæc tribuitur Osio, Cordubensi episcopo, sed ambigitur quem ob titulum, aliis dicentibus, illum hoc honore potitum fuisse, quatenus legatum sedis Apostolicæ; *sed nullum est istius legationis vestigium.* Putant alii hoc factum fuisse, ob virtutem ejus, scientiam, et experientiam singulares, necnon grandævitatem, quæ ipsi magnam venerationem conciliabat. Si fides haberi posset subscriptionibus hujus concilii, quæ leguntur concil. tom. ii. p. 50, &c., inde concluderetur, episcopos in eo sedisse, secundum ordinem suæ provinciæ." Expos. Jur. Can. tom. i. p. 87.

not preside over other general councils, which yet were never doubted by the Church.

[1] "The same thing," (viz. that the bishops sat according to the order of their provinces) "may be inferred," says Gibert, "from the subscriptions of the first council of Constantinople, so far as concerns the session of those who were actually present, if they are worthy of credit: namely, that Nectarius presided, since his subscription is first of all. But this head of the presidency brings suspicion upon the subscriptions; because it is certain that St. Gregory Nazianzen presided, for Nectarius was not elected until after the fathers had subscribed. The same may be said of the subscriptions of the Egyptian bishops, who were not present at the council, unless indeed by a subscription ready made. Both these facts we learn from the life of Gregory. The subscriptions of this council, in the 'Bibliotheca' of Justellus, carry a notable mark of falsehood; for among those who subscribed that council, there are reckoned three who were legates of S. Leo, the pope, at the council of Chalcedon, celebrated seventy years after, namely, A. D. 451. Whereas the council of Constantinople was held A. D. 381."

Note this, brethren, I beseech you; for it carries a double evidence against the papal prerogative. The

[1] "Idem inferri licet ex subscriptionibus Constantinopolitani I. quoad sessionem eorum, qui illi interfuerunt, modo tamen fide dignæ sint. Item Nectarium in eo præsedisse, cum primus omnium scribatur; sed hoc præsidentiæ caput subscriptiones suspectas facit: quia certum est sanctum Gregorium Nazianzenum præsedisse, cum Nectarius non nisi post subscriptiones patrum, electus fuerit. Idem est de subscriptionibus episcoporum Egypti, qui ad concilium non advenerunt, nisi perfecta jam subscriptione. Factum utrumque discimus a Gregorio in ejus vita,—— Subscriptiones hujus concilii in Bibliotheca Justelli, p. 303, insignem gerunt falsitatis notam: nempe, iis, qui hoc concilium subscripsere, annumerantur tres legati S. Leonis, pontificis, ad concilium Calcedonense LXX. annis post celebratum, nempe, ann. 451. Constantinopolitanum ann. 381, habitum fuit." Ibid. p. 87.

simple fact that it furnishes another general council where the pope did not preside, either in person or by proxy, thereby confirming the view taken of the council of Nice, is one proof of no small importance. But the melancholy evidence of fraud, in the forgery of false subscriptions—names of the bishops of Egypt who were not present—and specially names of legates of the pope, who were probably not born at the time, since they were certainly present at another council held seventy years later; this evidence goes beyond any other, in my mind, to condemn the whole claim.

Brethren, it is not I who charge the transmitters of your records with forgery. True or false, genuine or corrupted, I have promised that I will take them as I find them, and will only question their truth, when I have your own warrant for doing so. But here is that warrant, furnished by one of your most celebrated canonists; and what, I pray you, is the inference to an unsophisticated mind? Apply the principle to any claim under heaven, and tell me whether the production of a false document on its behalf is not the most powerful evidence against it? Tell me whether a claim known to be true, primitive, universally acknowledged by those who lived before us, and, above all, derived from the authority of heaven, was ever yet defended by human forgery? Yea, tell me, whether the employment of a forgery in support of this prerogative, by those who first stooped to such a wretched artifice, does not demonstrate *their* perfect conviction, that the claim itself was utterly unfounded in justice and in truth?

I do not charge this forgery upon the present race, nor upon any except those who committed, or willingly and knowingly sustain the fraud. I doubt not that the great majority amongst you would spurn such miserable aid, and with one voice condemn the cause which relied

upon it. But it is not the only instance which will meet our eyes before our course is ended; and although it has presented itself out of the regular track of my argument, you will not wonder that I did not pass it by, even at the cost of a brief digression.

Following, then, the track of evidence in the direct line of antiquity, I find our author next stating as follows:

[1] "With regard," saith he, "to the other six general councils of the east, it is known certainly from their acts, who presided over them, and what was the order of their session. And in the most ancient of them, the council of Ephesus, it is, by the greater part of its seven acts, established, that St. Cyril, the patriarch of Alexandria, presided."

[2] "In all the meetings of the fifth general council," continues our author, "called the second council of Constantinople, it is established that the patriarch of that city presided: for he is recorded the first of the fathers in the beginning of each. The same appears at the end of the eighth or last, where the subscriptions are set down: for the subscription of this patriarch is the first of all. But this patriarch presided over that council, because Vigilius, the pope, did not choose to be present, either by himself or by legates."

Here we have a fact, brethren, which, although evi-

[1] "Quoad reliqua sex concilia generalia orientalia, ex eorum actis certo cognoscitur, quis illis præsederit, quisque sessionis ordo fuerit, Utque ab antiquissimo eorum, Ephesino, ordiar, in plerisque vii. actionum ejus, cernitur, sanctum Cyrillum, Patriarcham Alexandrinum, præsedisse." Ibid.

[2] "In singulis collationibus quinti concilii generalis, sive Constantinop. II. cernitur, patriarcham hujus urbis ipsi præsedisse; nam primus omnium patrum scribitur, in principio singularum. Idem videtur in fine 8, seu ultimæ, ubi subscriptiones referuntur, nam subscriptio patriarchæ omnium prima est, *Conc.* tom. v. Hic autem patriarcha præfuit huic concilio, quia Vigilius pontifex, neque ipse, neque per legatos, interesse voluit." p. 88.

dently stated as a mode of accounting for the patriarch of Constantinople presiding over the council instead of the pope, proves, in truth, a great deal more. For, according to your canon law, it is necessary to the very existence of a general council, that the pope should first summon it, and secondly preside in it. But here was a council in which the pope did not chuse to make his appearance, either in person or by his legates. It was not one of the excepted cases in which the council of Constance long afterwards determined that the consent of the pope was not necessary. But it presented the very case in which, according to your present doctrine, the council could not have been held at all. And yet *it was held*, although the pope was not willing to sanction it by his presence or by his legates; thus clearly shewing that THE FATHERS OF THAT COUNCIL DID NOT ACKNOWLEDGE YOUR DOCTRINE, but held themselves as competent to the celebration of a general council without the pope, as with him.

There is yet another class of facts, noted by our author on this point of the presidency of general councils, which he very consistently calls singular. "In the sixth general council," saith he, "there is something singular about the presidency, namely, that in the beginning of eighteen of its sessions, it is said, that the emperor Constantine Pogonatus presided: *Our most pious emperor presiding*[1]."

Nor is this a solitary instance, for he proceeds to mention, "The singularity above observed in the sixth general council, concerning the presidency, has also a place occasionally in the seventh general council, for

[1] "Est aliquid singulare in sixto concilio generali, circa præsidentiam, nimirum, in principio singularum xviii. actionum ejus, dicitur, imperatorem Constantinum Pogonatum præfuisse; *Præsidente pissimo Imperatore.*" Ibid.

there it is said, in the eighth session, that the empress Irene, with the emperor, her son, presided [1]."

And once more: "The same things appear," saith he, "in the eighth general council concerning the presidency, as in the sixth and seventh, for in sessions 6, 7, 8, it is said that the emperor Basil presided, "*Our most pious emperor presiding* [2]."

Nay, even in the general councils of the western Church, where your present doctrine might have been expected to be always professed, if any where, there were some instances totally subversive of the importance which it claims. Thus [3], "It is certain," says Gibert, "that the pope was not present in any manner at the council of Pisa, either by himself or by legates. Nor in the council of Basil, were the legates of the pontiff present, unless at some of the sessions when he recalled them," &c.

Brethren, how much more evidence is necessary to demonstrate the proposition, that your second canonical essential to the holding of a general council, was not and could not have been supposed essential by the Church of Rome, at the primitive day? I know well how ingeniously your writers manage this difficulty, so as to leave unharmed your modern doctrine; but the facts them-

[1] "Singularitas supra observata in concilio generali sexto circa præsidentiam, locum habet aliquatenus in concilio generali vii. ibi enim in actione 8. dicitur, Irenem Imperatricem, cum filio suo Imperatore præfuisse." Ibid.

[2] "Eadem fere videntur in octavo concilio generali circa præsidentiam ut in sexto et in septimo, nam in Actionibus 6, 7, 8, dicitur Imperatorem Basilium præfuisse; *Præsidente piissimo Imperatore.*" Ibid. p. 89.

[3] "Quoad reliqua concilia, certum est, pontificem nullo modo interfuisse concilio Pisano, neque per se, neque per legatos,——quoad concilium Basileense, legatos pontificis non adfuisse nisi quibusdam sessionibus, cum eos revocaverit, quoties dissolvit," &c. Ibid. p. 86.

selves are undeniable, and speak a language not to be mistaken.

That the first general council, namely, the council of Nice, was called, not by the pope, but by the emperor; and that the bishop of Cordova in Spain, presided in it:

That the greater part of all the other general councils were also called by the emperors, and that their presidents were taken sometimes from one see, and sometimes from another, and that frequently the sovereigns that called them presided:

That even in the neighbourhood of Rome, there have been general councils called and conducted without the action of the pope:

These facts prove, beyond the power of fair argument to question, that the fathers who composed these several councils did not profess nor believe your doctrine: viz. that the pope is the vicar of Christ, holding the place of God upon the earth; that he is the head of the catholick Church by divine right; that the general councils of the Church when summoned and presided over by him, possess the attribute of infallibility, but that if he does not summon and preside in them, they are unlawful.

And hence I think it is demonstrated, that in the second requisite of the doctrine of councils, the primitive Church of Rome did not hold your present system, and therefore, in this too, you have changed.

I add one observation more in answer to any argument drawn from the subscriptions to the council of Nice, which are stated differently by different writers. Thus Gelasius states them in the following form:

"Hosius, the bishop of Cordova, for the Holy Churches of God which are at Rome, and in all Italy and Spain, and in the rest of the nations dwelling beyond even to

the ocean, by those who were with him, Vito and Vincent, presbyters of Rome [1]."

This, surely, looks very well, and accords admirably with the assertion that Hosius presided as the deputy of the pope, along with his legates. But a little attention shows us that Gelasius does not profess to give the words of the real subscriptions: for, first, he sets down only thirteen names out of three hundred and eighteen; and secondly, he graces these with a rhetorical flourish, as for example, "Leontius, of Cesarea in Cappadocia, the ornament of the Church of the Lord"—"Protogenes, that admirable man," &c.[2] Every one must see, that names set down in this way have no claim for accuracy to be compared with a copy from the original subscriptions.

But the common version of the doings of this council, which stands first in your own books and possesses your highest confidence, has a catalogue, as you know, at the end of it, in which the names of all the bishops are professedly given, as subscribed by their own hands: and this catalogue states the matter very differently, viz.

[3] "Hosius, bishop of the city of Cordova of the province of Spain, has said: Thus I believe, as it is above written."

"We, Victor and Vincent, presbyters of the city of

[1] "Osius episcopus Cordubæ sanctis Dei ecclesiis, quæ Romæ sunt, et in Italia et Hispania tota, et in reliquis ulterius nationibus usque ad oceanum commorantibus, per eos qui cum ipso erant, Romanos presbyteros Vitonem et Vincentium." Gel. Hist. Concil. Nicæn. Mansi Concil. tom. ii. in loco.

[2] "Leontius Cæsareæ Cappadociæ, ecclesiæ Domini ornamentum,"——"Protogenes ille admirabilis," &c. Ibid.

[3] "Subscripserunt trecenti decem et octo episcopi, qui in eodem concilio convenerunt.

"Osius episcopus civitatis Cordubensis provinciæ Hispaniæ dixit: Ita credo sicut superius scriptum est.

"Victor

Rome, for the venerable man, our father and bishop, St. Sylvester, have subscribed, thus believing, as it is above written."

Then follow the names of the other subscribers; and the whole document, as it stands, fully sustains the conclusion stated by your canonist Gibert, nor, indeed, is it fairly capable of any other construction.

"Victor et Vincentius presbyteri urbis Romæ pro venerabili viro papa et episcopo nostro sancto Silvestro subscripsimus, ita credentes, sicut supra scriptum est." Mansi Concil. tom. ii. p. 692.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Brethren in Christ,

In examining the testimony directly borne by the council of Nice on the subject of the pope's supremacy, and the dominion of the Church of Rome, I propose to extract in full those canons of that great council which bear upon the question, subjoining your own Latin version, for your greater satisfaction.

CANON 6.

[1] "Let the ancient customs be kept, which are established in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, that the bishop of Alexandria may have power over all these, forasmuch as this is the custom with the bishop of Rome. In like manner, also, in Antioch, and in the other provinces, let the privileges, the dignities, and the authority of the Churches be preserved. This, too, is altogether manifest,

[1] "Antiqui mores serventur, qui sunt in Egypto, Libya, et Pentapoli, ut Alexandrinus episcopus horum omnium habeat potestatem, quandoquidem et episcopo Romano hoc est consuetum. Similiter et in Antiochia, et in aliis provinciis sua privilegia ac suæ dignitates et auctoritates ecclesiis serventur. Illud autem est omnino manifestum, quod si quis absque metropolitani sententia factus sit episcopus, eum magna Synodus definivit non esse episcopum. Quod si quidem communi omnium electione, quæ et rationi consentanea, et ex regula ecclesiastica facta est, duo vel tres propter suam, qua delectantur, contentionem contradicant, vincant plurium suffragia." Gent. Herveto interprete. Mansi Concil. tom. ii. p. 669.

that if any be made bishop, without the decision of his metropolitan, this great council decrees him not to be a bishop. But if it be by the common choice of all, which is agreeable to reason, and according to the ecclesiastical rule, and two or three oppose him for the sake of the contention in which they delight, let the suffrages of the greater part prevail."

CANON 7.

[1] "Since an ancient tradition and custom has obtained, that he who is bishop in Jerusalem should be honoured, let him have the fruits of this honour, the proper dignity of the metropolis being preserved."

Now here, brethren, is the whole which refers in any way to the subject in question, but it is abundantly sufficient to substantiate the charge of innovation, in many important particulars.

For, in the first place, it is obvious to any reflecting mind, that there could have been no motive for passing the sixth canon, unless the fathers of the council had reason to apprehend some encroachment on the liberties of the catholic Church. What this encroachment was, we have already learned from Irenæus, Cyprian, and Eusebius. The disposition to lord it over God's heritage, for which Irenæus rebuked Victor, one pope of Rome, and Cyprian and Firmilian rebuked Stephen, another pope, had given warning, long before the council of Nice, of the quarter in which a monopoly of power was likely to accumulate. The immense advantage which the Church of Rome possessed by her location in the empire city of the world, thereby giving the Church of Rome a real primacy of influence, was doubtless not only understood by her rulers, but by the other portions of the catholic Church; and

[1] "Quoniam obtinuit consuetudo et antiqua traditio, ut qui est in Ælia episcopus honoretur; habeat honoris consequentiam; metropoli propria dignitate servata." Ib. p. 673.

its tendency towards a far stronger and more lofty kind of pre-eminence was perhaps sufficiently manifest to excite a natural apprehension in the patriarchs of the other provinces. With this clue, it is easy to see why such a canon should be proposed and passed in this famous council: and thus understood, it was a measure of wise and necessary precaution.[1]

But look, I pray you, at its provisions. "Let the ancient customs be kept in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, that the bishop of Alexandria may have power over all these, forasmuch as this is the *custom* also with the bishop of Rome." Is there any subordination here of Alexandria to Rome? Is there any recognition of Roman preroga-

[1] I am sorry to be obliged, here, to notice one of those cases in which your writers have thought it expedient to *make* authority when they could find none. This canon is found in many of your books very differently expressed. As for example in the Codex of the Canons and Constitutions of the Church of Rome, in the appendix to the works of Leo the Great, we read the Canon in question under a different number, and with these words: "Ecclesia Romana semper habeat primatum." i. e. "Let the Roman Church always have the primacy," after which follows the rest.

Now the learned editor Quesnel, one of your own most zealous men, admits in the note to this canon, that the words in question are "doubted by some." And he states honestly that they are "neither in the Greek text, nor were they found in any other version, nor in the subsequent Roman Code of Dionysius. So that it cannot be doubted that they either crept from the margin into the text, or were added by the clergy or others of the Roman Church, lest the Holy Fathers might seem forgetful of the Roman dignity." The words of the author are added for your greater satisfaction.

"An vero verba hæc: Romana Ecclesia semper primatum habuit vel habeat: partem Canonis constituant, an titulum, in dubium a nonnullis vocatur. Litem, ni fallor, dirimunt Codices MSS. in quibus et suus titulus ab his verbis distinctus canoni tribuitur, et hæc canonem ipsum, ut pars, ordiuntur: Ut pars, inquam, sed adjectitia: quæ videlicet nec in ipso posteriori Codice Romano Dionysii reperitur: ut dubium non sit vel eam ex margine irrepsisse in textum, vel a Romanæ Ecclesiæ clericis aliisve esse additam, ne Romanæ dignitatis obliti esse SS. Patres viderentur." Leonis Mag. Opp. om. tom. ii. p. 13.

tive over Alexandria? Plainly not, but the contrary. As *custom* had given the bishop of Rome power over the Churches of the province of Italy, so custom had given to the bishop of Alexandria power over the Churches of Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis. The one power is manifestly compared to the other power, the one custom to the other custom. "In like manner," continues the canon, "let the privileges, the dignities, and the authority of the Churches in Antioch and the other provinces be preserved." Why so? What was threatening them? Men do not usually say, "Let a thing be preserved," unless there is danger. Why did not the council of Nice manifest the same solicitude for the dignity and the authority of the Church of Rome? Why, in providing for all the other provinces, did they not put in some clause saving the rights and privileges of the apostolic see? Ah!

You are probably accustomed, brethren, to read this canon with this addition: but many of you are aware, and all of you ought to be aware, that it is no part of the actual work of the Nicene council. The words as I have taken them, and from which I shall support my reasoning, are copied verbatim from your own collection of the councils; and when I deny the authority of the unwarrantable addition made to the real canon, I shew you that I am borne out by the acknowledgment of your own most competent and candid men.

But this is not the only place in which the Church of Rome has made additions to the Nicene canons. The right of appeal to the Roman bishop, [p. 15, 16. Can 30, 31. and 34.] belongs to the same class. And the whole of this subject calls for the acknowledgment of the same Quesnel, where in his preface, p. xi. he states that the discipline of the Roman Church led her to *reject some of the oriental canons* and *to change others, in order to accommodate them to her own use.* "Præterea antiqua Romanæ Ecclesiæ disciplina ex istâ versione [sc. Isidori] innotescit, dum aliquos Canones Orientales ab ea rejectos docet, alios mutatos suoque accommodatos usui: quod ex Dionysii versione obscurum manet, quippe qui Canones ad fidem Græci textus transtulit, non habita ratione receptæ ab Ecclesia Romana disciplinæ." How does this acknowledgment agree with the claim of infallibility set up for the decrees of this famous council, upon the one hand; and how does it accord with the confidence demanded in the good faith of your traditions on the other?

brethren, it is easy to understand why this famous canon extended a shield of protection over the rest of the Catholic Church, and left Rome to take care of herself. There was no lack of strength in that quarter, but rather the manifestation of undue vigour, which then, indeed, only showed the proportions of the infant Hercules, but reached a marvellous maturity in due time.

There is a second feature in this canon, however, worthy of great attention. The authority of the bishop of Rome is attributed, like that of the bishop of Alexandria, to *custom*. Where was the chair of Peter—the keys of the kingdom of heaven—the vicarship of Christ—the authority, not of a mere man, but of God upon the earth, according to your present canon law—when the fathers of the council of Nice drew up this decree? Alas! brethren, these holy men knew nothing of this sublime fabric of divine authority. They knew not that they were all built on the foundation of that one diocese, and that they owed the reverence of children to the mother and mistress Church of Rome.

A third point of no small importance meets us in the latter part of this canon, namely, that no one should be made bishop without the consent of his proper metropolitan. But your canon law says that "the translation, the deposition or resignation of a bishop, is reserved to the Roman pontiff alone, not so much by any canonical constitution as by the divine institution." And again: "As the translation, the deposition, and resignation of bishops, so likewise the confirmation of the electors, after their election, is reserved to the Roman pontiff alone, by reason of the spiritual bond." How is it, brethren, that the council recognized nothing of all this? How is it that they allowed no confirmation or consent whatever to supersede the claims of the proper metropolitan, totally ignorant that the bishop of Rome was the fountain of all

ecclesiastical authority, having derived from the grant of Christ himself, through the person of Peter, THE PLENITUDE OF POWER?

The same principle meets us under another form, in the seventh canon, which the council of Nice passed in favour of the bishop of Jerusalem. "Since an ancient tradition and custom has obtained, that he who is bishop in Jerusalem should be honoured," saith this canon, "let him have the fruits of this honour, the proper dignity of the metropolis being preserved." Of course, brethren, you are aware that the metropolis of Jerusalem was Cesarea; and frequent were the disputes which afterwards arose between the rights of the metropolitan and the honour of Jerusalem. But here, as in the other canon, we see the council referring to custom and ancient tradition; desirous to prevent encroachment, and altogether silent with respect to Rome.

I proceed to some other canons of this celebrated council, in order to establish my assertion, that while you claim such infallible authority for its decrees, yet your own Church does not even professedly observe them.

Thus the fifth canon is in these words: [1] "Concerning those who are separated from the communion, whether they be of the clerical order or of the laity, by the bishops of each province, let their sentences stand good, according to the canon which declares that those who are ejected by some are not to be admitted by others: but it may be examined whether they have been expelled from the congregation, by the pusillanimity, or by the contention, or by any severity of the bishop concerned. And in order

[1] "De iis qui a communione segregati sunt, sive clericorum sive laicorum sint ordinis, ab episcopis, qui sunt in unaquaque provincia, valeat sententia secundum canonem, qui pronunciat eos, qui ab aliis ejecti sunt, non esse ab aliis admittendos: examinetur autem, numquid vel pusillanimitate, vel contentione, vel aliqua ejusmodi episcopi acerbitate, congregatione pulsi

that this examination may be conveniently made, it is expedient, that there should be a council in each province twice in every year: that when all the bishops of the province are together, these questions may be settled; and thus those whom their bishop happens to have displeased, may be seen by all to have been justly separated from the congregation, until it may seem right to the council of bishops to decree a milder sentence. And one of these councils shall be held before Lent, in order that all stains may be cleansed from the mind, and a pure offering be made unto God," (sc. at Easter) "and the second shall be held in autumn."

The twelfth canon is as follows: [1] "Those who have been called by grace, and have manifested their first ardour, and have laid aside their girdles, but have returned, afterwards, like dogs to their vomit," &c. "Let these be prostrate suppliants for ten years, after having been hearers for three years. But in all these cases the ground and appearance of the penitence should be examined. For those who with fear, and tears, and patience, and good works, exhibit a conversion in deed, and not in appearance only, should deservedly have com-

sint. Ut hoc ergo convenientem examinationem accipiat, recte habere visum est, ut singulis annis in unaquaque provincia bis in anno synodi fiant: ut cum omnes provinciæ episcopi in eundem locum communiter conveniant, ejusmodi quæstiones examinentur; et sic quos episcopum offendisse constiterit, juste esse a congregatione separati apud omnes videantur, donec episcoporum congregationi videatur pro iis humaniorem proferre sententiam. Synodi autem fiant, una quidem ante quadragesimam, ut omnibus animi sordibus sublatis, purum munus Deo offeratur: secunda autem autumni tempore." Mansi Concil. tom. ii. p. 669.

12.

[1] "Qui autem a gratia quidem evocati, et primum suum ardorem ostenderunt, et cingula deposuerunt, postea autem ut canes ad suum vomitum reversi sunt," &c. "hi decem annis prosternantur supplices, etiam post triennii auditionis tempus. In his autem omnibus examinare convenit consilium et speciem pœnitentiæ. Quicumque enim et metu, et lachry-

munion in the prayers when the above-mentioned period of hearing is fulfilled: besides which, it may be lawful for their bishops to establish something more indulgent respecting them. But as for those who do not feel their condition so seriously, nor think it of much consequence whether their privileges are restored, but esteem it enough for their conversion to enter the Churches, let them fulfil the whole time appointed."

And the 20th canon regulates a point of form in public worship, in these words: "Since there are some who bend their knees on the Lord's day and on the days of Pentecost: in order that all things may be observed alike in all places, the holy council has decreed that those devotions should be performed standing [1]."

Now here, brethren, permit me to remind you, that the authority of a general council, according to your canon law, is the same with the authority of the Scripture and the Holy Spirit, because it represents the whole Church, and the same Holy Spirit who dictated the Scriptures, also dictates its decrees. Your Doway catechism, speaking to the same point, declares that the definitions of a general council approved by the pope, are the dictates of the Holy Ghost, according to that of the apostles, "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."

But here is the first general council, approved by the pope, and by the whole Christian world, passing many

mis, et tolerantia, et bonis operibus conversionem et opere et habitu ostendunt, hi impleto auditionis tempore quod præfinitum est, merito orationum communionem habebunt, cum eo quod liceat etiam episcopo humanius aliquod de eis statuere. Quicumque autem non adeo graviter tulerunt, nec multum sua referre existimarunt, satisque esse putarunt in ecclesias ingredi ad conversionem, tempus omnino impleant."

[1] "Quoniam sunt quidam in die Dominico genua flectentes, et in diebus pentecostes: ut omnia in universis locis consonanter observentur, placuit sancto concilio, stantes Domino vota persolvere." Hard. Conc. tom. i. p. 331.

important canons, which, even among yourselves, notwithstanding their infallible and supreme authority, were soon considered a dead letter.

For I beseech you, how do you regard the rights and privileges of the Churches of Alexandria, Egypt, Antioch, and Jerusalem, which the council of Nice was so careful to protect and preserve?

How do you regard the canon providing for the yearly holding of two provincial synods, in which the judgment of each bishop might be rectified by his brethren?

How do you reconcile with this your present canon law, which, instead of preserving the primitive course marked out by the Nicene council, refers all the judgments of the bishops to the pope?

How do you observe the Nicene canon commanding so many years of penitence and good works before great offenders could be restored to the communion?

And how have you obeyed the 20th canon, which censures the custom of kneeling on the Lord's day, and at Easter; and directs standing as being, at those times, the proper posture? Indeed this last canon is worthy of more than a passing remark; because you know, I presume, that the Church of Rome pursued the very course which the canon censured, in saying, "There are *some* who bend their knees on the Lord's day," &c. And you know, also, that the Church of Rome disregarded this decree of the council, and continues her own custom until the present hour. Here, then, you perceive two facts, well deserving your attention. First, you see how little the council regarded the custom of the Church of Rome. And secondly, you see how little the Church of Rome regarded the decree of the council.

It results then, brethren, that, although you call this council infallible, and rank its decrees with the Word of God and the dictates of the Holy Ghost, yet, on all the

canons which I have cited, the practice of your Church stands in opposition to her theory.

I am aware that you will reply by stating your favourite distinction between matters of faith and discipline, and you may say that you do not hold a general council to be an infallible director, unless in matters of faith alone. But it may be worth your while to ask, on what basis you rest this allegation.

Certainly not on the Scriptures; for the very instance referred to in your Doway catechism, when the apostles passed their decree, saying, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us," was altogether respecting what you would call discipline, and totally irrespective of faith. If the Holy Spirit dictated decrees of discipline in this apostolic council, and if, as you say, this council is your great authority for all subsequent councils, why, I beseech you, do you now decide, that matters of discipline are not determined by his divine agency, but matters of faith alone?

Neither do you ground this distinction on the authority of the fathers, for none of the early fathers claim infallibility for the decrees of a general council, except on the foundation of their Scriptural correctness: and whatever obedience was rendered by the primitive Church to the decrees of the council in point of faith, was equally expected in point of discipline.

Neither can you support this distinction on the ground of reason. For although there is an inherent superiority in the propositions which concern faith, over those which concern discipline, since the subjects of the first are in their own nature immutable, while the subjects of the second may be, and often have been changed, yet this truth has no relation to the question whether the Holy Spirit has dictated them. You may indeed say, and say most truly, that the principles of the faith are proposi-

tions concerning the nature, the attributes, and the purposes of God, in reference to man's redemption, together with the merciful execution of those purposes, as set forth in the mission of Christ and the system of his Gospel; that these were the same in substance from the beginning, and in their own nature could not admit of change. Hence, the pious Abel was an example of the same faith which was professed by St. Paul. While on the other hand, the discipline directed for the Church in the patriarchal age, differed from the Mosaic economy, and this again differed from the discipline established by the apostles for the Christian dispensation, strictly so called; and therefore we have the same substantial faith, in connexion with many forms of discipline. This is all plain and incontrovertible, but it does not warrant your inference from it. For, I beseech you, were not all these forms of discipline the dictates of the Holy Spirit, *at the time they were established*, and were they not binding, as such, until the authority of the same Spirit sanctioned a change? Was not the discipline of the Mosaic economy given under the solemn obligation of "Thus saith the Lord?" And was it not believed to be applicable to the Gentile Churches, until their freedom was established by the very same authority: "It seemeth good to the Holy Ghost and to us?" Yea, was there ever a period within the whole course of the Scripture history, in which the Lord was ready to dictate to his Church in matters of faith, but abandoned it to itself, in matters of discipline? Or was there ever a council which claimed to itself any greater measure of inspiration in one part of its deliberations than it claimed in all?

The truth is, brethren, that just as we see the creative power of God ready to manifest itself not only in the formation of the angels and archangels, but also in the minute organization of the smallest insect—just as the

same divine energy which binds the planets in their orbits, condescends to notice the fall of the sparrow to the ground, and clothes even the lilies of the field, and the grass "which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven"—even so does the Holy Spirit who dictates the principles of faith, dictate likewise every thing necessarily connected with that faith, in its lowest and apparently least important particular. There can be no Church without faith, therefore faith is essential. But neither can a Church exist as a visible society without discipline; for we agree that the ministry and the sacraments are essential to the existence of the visible Church on earth, and yet these, at least in their details, are matters of discipline, and are therefore not embraced in the creed of the council of Nice, nor in any of the earlier synods. But are not the ministry and the sacraments as truly ordained by Christ and the Holy Spirit, as any other branch of the divine system? Nay, does not the great apostle, when regulating many minor points of discipline in the Corinthian Church, expressly claim the authority of the Saviour, by declaring, "If any man among you think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge what I say to be the commandments of our Lord Jesus Christ." Surely, then, your proposition, that in decrees touching faith a general council is infallibly directed by the Holy Spirit, but that in decrees touching discipline, it is liable to error, stands utterly unsustained by any Scriptural authority, or by any reason drawn from Scripture, or from the analogy of the other works of God: and therefore I must needs conclude that it is an hypothesis devised to meet the difficulty, in which your confessed departure from the strictness of the ancient discipline has involved your claims to immutability. That it was no part of the system of the primitive Church of Rome—that there was no infallibility claimed for general

councils until long after the more important ones were holden, and no difference between their decrees except what rested on the authority of Scripture,—will plainly appear from the testimony of the fathers subsequent to the Nicene council; and to these I shall now proceed.

CHAPTER XIX.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

I HAVE said that the fathers of the age in which the council of Nice was held, did not attribute any infallibility to it, nor did they speak of it in such terms as would at all comport with your canon law, where it ascribes to general councils "the same authority as the Scriptures and the Holy Spirit." In proof of this assertion, let us turn to the next witness in the order of chronology, viz. the celebrated Athanasius; who himself assisted at that council, and was afterwards bishop of Alexandria. You know, brethren, that his name stands at the highest point of estimation, being, indeed, the most distinguished on the very subject for the decision of which the council of Nice was called. His works may be set down to A. D. 327.

The greater part of this author's labours were devoted to sustaining the council of Nice against the opposition of the Arians, and hence it is manifest, that if your present doctrine of general councils had then been the doctrine of the Church, his writings would furnish abundant evidence in your favour. Instead of which, they display the plainest demonstration, as it seems to me, that Athanasius had never conceived such an idea. From his decretal epistle on the very subject itself, I shall extract several passages to show that he defends

the council by Scripture and tradition, but never assumes the ground that its decisions were equal to Scripture, and dictated by the Holy Spirit. I cite for its greater convenience your own Latin version.

He commences his epistle by stating [1] that the "Arians being now condemned by all, presume to murmur after the manner of the Jews, demanding, truly, why the fathers who assembled at Nice, adopted the words essence, and consubstantial, which words are not to be found in Scripture." He then proceeds to justify the doctrine of the council by Scripture at great length, and thus accounts for the adoption of the new terms.

[2] "The cause of it," (saith he) "was the following:

[1] Epist. Decret. de Synod. Nic. Op. om. S. Athan. ed. Col. 1686. tom. i. p. 248. "Ab omnibus condemnati, [sc. Ariani] etiam nunc quoque more Judæorum obmurmurare ausint, expostulantes scilicet, cur patres, qui Niceæ convenerant, has voces, Essentiam et Consubstantialitatem, nusquam in sacris literis repertas, usurparint."

[2] Ibid. p. 267. "Causa autem hujusmodi fuit. Cum Synodus in hoc esset, ut Arianorum impia vocabula tolleret, et voces adhibere vellet, quæ sine controversia sacrarum literarum essent, nimirum eum Filium esse, et nequaquam ex non entibus esse, sed ex Deo: eumque et Verbum esse, et Sapientiam, et nequaquam creaturam aut facturam, sed germen proprium sui Patris: Eusebiani pro inveterata sua et prava opinione volebant illud, ex Deo esse, commune esse, et ad homines quoque pertinere, neque quicquam Christum eo nomine a nobis differre, eo quod scriptum esset, *Unus Deus, ex quo omnia*; et rursum, *Vetera transierunt, ecce nova facta sunt omnia: omnia vero ex Deo.* Ibi patres, animadversa illorum fraude et impietatis vafritie, coacti sunt clarioribus verbis exponere, quid sit ex Deo esse, et scribere, Filium ex substantia Dei esse, ne ex Deo esse, et commune, et æque ad Filium et creaturas pertinere existimaretur; cætera igitur omnia creaturas dixere, excepto Verbo, quod solum ex Patre genitum esse crediderunt, et cætera quoque ex Deo esse, verum non eadem ratione, qua Filius."——"Certe cum Paulus omnia dixisset ex Deo esse, statim subintulit: *Et unus Dominus Jesus Christus, per quem omnia:* ut omnibus ostenderet, Filium esse alium a cæteris rebus a Deo creatis." ——"Ideo enim Sacrosancta Synodus liquidius dixit, eum ex substantia Patris esse," &c.

When the council were occupied in taking away the impious language of the Arians, and desired to avail themselves of those phrases which were allowed to be Scriptural, namely, that Christ was the Son, that he did not come from non-existence but from God, that he was the Word, and the Wisdom of God, and by no means a creature, or made, but the proper offspring of the Father: the Eusebians, exhibiting their inveterate and wicked opinion, wished it to be understood that Christ's being of God was common to mankind, and that in this respect he differed nothing from ourselves, inasmuch as it was written, "*One God, from whom are all things;*" and again, "*Old things have passed away, behold all things are made new: and all things are of God.*" Then the fathers, observing their fraud and impious subtlety, WERE CONSTRAINED to express in clearer words what it was to be from God, and to write that the Son was of the substance of God, lest it might be taught that the being from God was common, and equally belonging to the Son and to the creatures: therefore they said that all others were creatures, except the Word, who alone they believed was generated from the Father, and the rest were also indeed from God, but not in like manner as the Son."——"For certainly, when Paul saith that all things are of God, he immediately adds: *And one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things:* that he might show to all that the Son was distinct from all other things which were created by the Deity."———"Hence the holy council said more clearly, that he was consubstantial with the Father," &c. How very different, brethren, is this style of defence from your doctrine! How much more short and simple would Athanasius' argument appear if he could have said: All general councils are infallible, because their decrees are dictated by the Holy

Ghost, and are equal to Scripture. The council of Nice was a general council, and therefore the controversy is settled by its decision.

Again, however, he repeats substantially his former justification in these words: [1] "Assuredly I should not deny that the signs and symbols of truth are expressed with *more perfection* in the language of the holy Scriptures than in any other: but the malignity and cunning impiety of the Eusebians compelled the bishops, as I before said, to use clearer words in order to subvert their impiety. Nevertheless it is sufficiently demonstrated and appears plainly, that the writings of the council contain the true opinion," &c. It is not necessary, brethren, to remind you, that the Eusebius whose followers are here spoken of, was Eusebius of Nicomedia, and not Eusebius of Cesarea, the historian.

Again, in his treatise concerning the councils of Ariminum and Seleucia, Athanasius speaks thus of the Nicene fathers: [2] "They did not write concerning the faith, It appears so: but, This is the faith of the catholic Church; and immediately their confession of faith is added, that they might show that it was not a new opinion, but apostolic; and that the things which they had written were not their inventions, but *apostolic documents*."

[1] Ibid. p. 282. "Certe id æquum esse nec ego abnuerim, eo quod signa indiciaque veritatis perfectiora ex scripturis sanctis, quam aliunde, depromantur: sed malignitas et versipellis Eusebianorum impietas episcopos coëgit, quemadmodum dixi, ut clarioribus verbis uterentur ad eorum impietatem subvertendam. Sed tamen satis demonstratum est, et liquide apparet, scripta Synodi rectam sententiam continere," &c.

[2] Ibid. p. 873. "De fide vero non scripserunt, Visum est, sed Ad istum modum credit Catholica Ecclesia, et statim confessio ipsa credendi adjuncta est, ut ostenderent, eam non novam esse sententiam sed apostolicam: et quæ ipsi scripsissent, non esse sua inventa, sed Apostolorum documenta."

Proceeding to show his reverence for Scripture, he censures the mania which existed for holding councils, and says: [1] "In vain therefore they (the Arians) run to and fro, pretending that they are asking councils concerning the faith, *when the divine Scripture is more powerful than all.*"

And in his epistle to the African bishops, he adduces another argument derived from tradition, in favour of the word consubstantial employed by the Nicene fathers. [2] "We know certain learned and famous bishops among the ancients," saith he, "and other writers, who used the word consubstantial, when speaking of the deity of the Father and the Son."

And again, he saith, [3] "With this understanding, truly, the fathers of the Nicene council wrote that the Son was consubstantial with the Father, and they pronounced an anathema against those who should say that the Son was of any other substance. Nor did they establish those words for themselves on that occasion, but they learned them from the *fathers who were before them*, as we said already." Now in these passages Athanasius gives us no intimation whatever of the Holy Spirit dictating the decrees of the council, but by necessary inference asserts the contrary; for surely, brethren, it needs no argument to show, that if he had thought the council was under the guidance of an infallible inspiration, he

[1] Ibid. "Frustra igitur circumcursitantes prætexunt, ob fidem synodos sese postulare, cum sit divina scriptura omnibus potentior."

[2] Ibid. 937. "Novimus quosdam ex priscis eruditos et præclaros antistites, aliosque scriptores, cum de Patris et Filii deitate loquerentur, voce consubstantialitatis usos esse."

[3] Ibid. 939. "Hoc intellectu videlicet, scripserunt patres Niceni Concilii, Filium Patri consubstantialem esse, eosque anathemate damnarunt, qui dicerent, ex alia substantia esse Filium. Neque hac in parte sibi ista vocabula finxerunt, sed a patribus, qui ante fuerunt, ea didicerunt, quemadmodum diximus."

would not have defended it merely by a recurrence to Scripture and tradition.

To show the contrariety, however, more clearly, it may be expedient to place your doctrine and that of Athanasius side by side.

You say that the authority of a general council, such as the Council of Nice, is *the same as the authority of Scripture.*

But Athanasius says, *the Scripture is more powerful than all.*

You say that *the Holy Spirit dictated its decrees.*

But Athanasius says that the fathers were compelled by the Arian subtlety to adopt words *which they learned from those that were before them.*

You refer your faith *to the decrees of the Council*, calling *it* infallible.

But Athanasius refers his faith only to the word of God, says not one word of this infallibility, and treats the council's decision as being correct, solely because *it was truly warranted by the Scriptures.*

I trust that the testimony of this most unexceptionable witness is sufficient to justify the assertion, that your doctrine on the inspiration and infallibility, of general councils was not the doctrine of your Church, at his day. His testimony on the other points of your claims to supremacy shall be presented in our next chapter.

CHAPTER XX.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

I PROCEED to notice a few other passages in the works of the celebrated Athanasius, in which his ideas of the Catholic Church will be easily discerned.

In his apology, addressed to the emperor Constantius, Athanasius states his coming to Rome, and having his cause laid before the council there, in order to justify himself from the false accusations of his Arian enemies, in the following words:

[1] "And these things, truly, the Egyptians communicated to all the bishops, and to the Roman bishop Julius. Wherefore the Eusebians sent letters to Julius, and in order to frighten us, *ordered a council to be called, and referred the arbitration of the case to Julius himself, if he were willing.* When, therefore, we had come to Rome, Julius immediately wrote to the Eusebians, by two of his presbyters, Elpidius and Philoxenes: but they, when they

[1] St. Athan. ad Imperat. Constant. Apol. Op. tom. i. p. 739.

"Hæc Ægyptii ad omnes et ad episcopum Romanum Julium scripsere. Quin et Eusebiani ad Julium literas misere, et ut nos terrerent, *Synodum jusserunt convocari*, et *ipsi Julio, si vellet, arbitrium causæ detulerunt.* Cum igitur Romam pervenissemus, Julius continuo ad Eusebianos literas scripsit, missis eo duobus ex suis presbyteris Elpidio et Philoxeno: illi vero, ubi nostram Romæ præsentiam audivissent, plurimum conturbati sunt, quod contra spem eorum me Romam contulissem. Rejecto igitur itinere, futiles inanesque tergiversando causificationes commentæ sunt, eo

heard of our presence at Rome, were greatly troubled, because, *contrary to their hopes, I had betaken myself to Rome.* Their journey therefore being given up, they devised sundry idle and vain pretences, because they were greatly alarmed lest the same crimes which Valens and Ursacius had confessed, should be laid to their charge also. Then the presbyter Vito brought more than fifty bishops into council, where our defence was allowed, and they confirmed their communion and love towards us, and were very indignant against the Eusebians, to whom, as he had received letters from them, *they ordered Julius* to write again. Julius wrote accordingly, and sent the letter by count Gabianus."

There are two or three points in this passage to which I beg leave to direct your attention.

Your canon law grants an appellate jurisdiction to the bishop of Rome in all ecclesiastical causes, BY DIVINE RIGHT. But the Arians, saith Athanasius, *ordered a council to be called*, and referred the cause to the arbitrement of Julius, *if he were willing*. He also says, that his going to Rome alarmed his adversaries, since they had hoped to terrify him from that measure, by their bold and confident course. He adds, that the council *ordered Julius to write*, who wrote accordingly. Now all of this is inconsistent with your canon law. For if the bishop of Rome was then acknowledged to be the appellate Judge, by divine right, of all ecclesiastical causes, Athanasius should have been cited before him. The Arians could not have offered to make him *arbitrator*, *if he were willing*, because

quod ingenti metu retinebantur, ne de iisdem criminibus, quæ Valens et Ursacius confessi erant, ipsi quoque convincerentur. Presbyter deinde Vito plures episcopos, quam quinquaginta, in concilium adduxit, ubi et nostra defensio recepta fuit, et confirmarunt in nos communionem et charitatem: magnaque indignatio exorta est contra Eusebianos, quibus Julium, cum ab eis literas acceperat, rescribere jusserunt. Scripsit igitur Julius, et misit literas per Gabianum Comitem."

he was already the judge by virtue of his office. Nor would it have been right or fitting to call a council of more than fifty bishops to hear Athanasius, when the right of decision lay with the "vicar of Christ," alone. Lastly, most incongruous of all would it seem, that this council should *order* Julius to write, when, instead of a letter of paternal remonstrance, it belonged to him to pronounce a binding and authoritative decree.

The letter of Julius, written in consequence, is a letter of frank but kindly expostulation throughout. He claims no superior rights, pronounces no official judgment, but argues with them on the apostolical canons, on the common custom of the Church, and on the principles of the Gospel. The Arians had thrust out Athanasius from his diocese, and had violently brought Georgius, with the aid of a military force, into his place: the consequence of which had been shameful tumults and outrages. Yet in a case so flagrant, mark the language of Julius. [1] "Where is there any ecclesiastical canon or apostolical tradition of this sort? That while the Church was in peace, and the bishops were in agreement with Athanasius the bishop of Alexandria, Georgius should be sent in, who was a stranger and a foreigner, neither baptized at Alexandria nor known to the people, nor asked for by the presbyters,—that he should be made a bishop at Antioch, and from thence be brought to Alexandria, not with the presbyters or the deacons of the city, nor with the bishops of Egypt, but

[1] Ibid. pp. 748, 9. "Ubi enim est istiusmodi ecclesiasticus canon, aut istiusmodi traditio apostolica? Ut in pace agenti ecclesiæ, et episcopis concordibus cum episcopo Alexandriæ Athanasio, immittere Georgium peregrinum et externum hominem, neque Alexandriæ baptizatum neque plebi cognitum, neque postulatum a presbyteris, eumque Antiochiæ creare episcopum, atque inde deducere Alexandriam, non cum presbyteris aut diaconis civitatis, non cum episcopis Ægypti, sed cum militibus? Hæc enim dixere et conquesti sunt, qui huc venerunt: si enim post Synodum in culpa fuisset deprehensus Athanasius, non tamen oportuit

with soldiers? For such is the assertion and complaint of those who have come here. If, truly, even after a council, Athanasius had been found guilty of any wrong, it would not have been fitting to create a new bishop so illegally, and in a manner so contrary to the ecclesiastical canon, but the bishop of the province should have constituted him in the Church itself, and from the sacerdotal order, and from the clergy itself, and by no means to have violated at this time the canons of the apostles. Come now, if the same conduct had been held towards any of yourselves, would you not have loudly exclaimed against it? Would you not have demanded that the violated canons should be sustained? Believe us, beloved, we speak truly as in the presence of God. This deed is not done piously, nor lawfully, nor ecclesiastically."

This epistle, however, brethren, is the more interesting because it proves the gradual advancement towards the primacy, which was yet far from being established. For near the close, Julius uses this language:

[1] "Therefore inform us more accurately, beloved brethren, concerning this matter, by which we may write to them, and to the other bishops, who ought to assemble here, that before all, those who are guilty may be condemned, and there be no further trouble in the Church." "For if, as you say, they were guilty, judgment should have been given according to the canon, and not in this

creationem novi episcopi ita illegaliter et præter canonem ecclesiasticum fieri, sed in ipsa ecclesia, et ex ipso sacerdotali ordine, et ex ipso clero illum ab episcopis provinciæ constitui oportuit, et nequaquam nunc Apostolorum Canones violari. Age, si in quemquam vestrum id commissume sset, nonne vociferaturi essetis? Nonne vindictam, quasi violatis canonibus, postulaturi fuissetis? Dilecti credite, tanquam Deo præsente, cum veritate loquimur. Non est istud pie factum, non ex jure, non ecclesiastice."

[1] Ibid. p. 753. "Certiores igitur nos, dilectissimi, de ea re facite, quo et illis scribamus, et cæteris item episcopis, qui huc debent convenire, ut

manner: *you should have written to us all, that so, by all, that which is just might be decreed.*—Why, therefore, in the first place, did you write nothing to us on the subject of Alexandria? Are you ignorant that *the custom is first to write to us*, that hence, what is just might be established? On which account, if any suspicion arose against a bishop, it ought to be referred to our Church. But now, after they have done what they thought proper, these men wish to have us approve the condemnation of a bishop, at whose doings we were not present, and concerning which we were not informed. Not such were the ordinations of Paul, not thus did the fathers teach, but this is truly a different example, and a new institution."

Here we see, plainly, a claim set up for the Church of Rome to be first informed of what is amiss, that justice may be done. But observe, first, brethren, that Julius contemplates the action of a council. "You should have written to us all," saith he, "that *so, by all, that which is just might be decreed.*" In the second place, this giving information to the Church of Rome is put on the score of custom. "*Are you ignorant,*" saith Julius, "*that this is the custom?*" and not one word is to be found that looks like a claim by divine right. Thirdly, here is no personal

coram omnibus, qui culpæ obnoxii sunt condemnentur, et ne ulterius perturbatio in ecclesia fiat."

"Nam si ut dicitis, omnino in culpa fuerunt, oportuit secundum canonem, et non isto modo judicium fieri: oportuit scriberi omnibus nobis, ut ita ab omnibus, quod justum esset, decerneretur.

"Cur igitur, in primis de Alexandrina civitate nihil nobis scribere voluistis? an ignari estis hanc consuetudinem esse, ut primum nobis scribatur, ut hinc, quod justum est, definiri posset? Quapropter si isthic hujusmodi suspicio in episcopum concepta fuerat, id huc ad nostram ecclesiam referri oportuit. Nunc autem nos, quos certiores minime fecerunt, postquam jam egerint quod libuit, suffragatores suæ damnationis, cui non interfuimus esse volunt. Non ita se habent Pauli ordinationes, non ita Patres docuerunt, sed aliud exemplum et novum est institutum."

authority for Julius himself as the vicegerent of Christ, the chief ruler and governor of the whole Church, &c. according to your present system. So that the whole case of Athanasius, to my mind, presents a complete demonstration of our proposition, and proves that the primitive Church of Rome, even so far down as the middle of the fourth century, held no such doctrine as her successor holds at the present day.

CHAPTER XXI.

Brethren in Christ,

We may not in justice dismiss the testimony of Athanasius until we see the course by which he was restored to his diocese, which will show us still more plainly the polity of the Church in the fourth century.

Pursuing the narrative of this eminent man, we find that the council of Rome, and the letter written on their part by Julius, produced no result. [1] "When the Roman council," continues Athanasius, "had written thus by Julius, the bishop of Rome, the Eusebians again, with wicked audacity, laid snares for the troubling of the Churches. And when this was made known to the most religious emperors, Constantius and Constans, the bishops of the east and west were ordered to assemble at Sardis."

In obedience to this imperial command, an immense number of bishops assembled from Spain, Italy, Gaul, Africa, Egypt, Cyprus, Palestine, Phrygia, Isauria, the names of whom Athanasius has for the most part set down, and computes the whole at three hundred and forty-

[1] Ibid. p. 754. "Hæc cum Romæ Synodus per Julium Romanum Episcopum scripsisset, improba iterum audacia Eusebiani in Ecclesiis perturbandis, insidiisque tendendis usi sunt. Quod cum rescitum esset ab religiosissimis Imperatoribus, Constantio et Constante, jussi sunt episcopi orientis et occidentis, Sardim convenire."

four. From the synodical epistle of this celebrated council I extract one sentence at the beginning, showing that it was convened by the emperors; and another near the close, referring to Athanasius. After premising a statement of the troubles which had taken place, and the fruitless effort of Julius and his brethren in the council of Rome to appease them, they proceed to say:

[1] "On which account, the grace of God co-operating, our most religious princes called us together from divers provinces and cities, desiring that a holy council should convene in the city of Sardis, by which every controversy might be cut off."

And after setting forth the conduct of the Arians at length, and the violent expulsion of the orthodox bishops, especially Athanasius, they say:

[2] "Therefore we pronounce our beloved brethren and fellow-ministers, Athanasius, Marcellus, Asclepas, and the rest who serve God with them and us, innocent and pure; letters being sent to all the dioceses, that the people of each Church may know the sincerity of their bishop."

The subscriptions follow, from which we find that Hosius of Spain presided, and signed first; and Julius of Rome, by his presbyters Archidamus and Philoxenus, signed after him. [3]

A few other little matters may be noticed in connexion with this witness.

[1] Ibid. 760, 1. "Quapropter, co-operante Dei gratia, religiosissimi principes nos ex diversis provinciis et civitatibus in unum convocaverunt cupientes, ut sancta synodus in Sardorum civitatem conveniret, quo omnis controversia præcideretur."

[2] Ibid. 766. "Ideo nos dilectos fratres et comministros nostros Athanasium, Marcellum, Asclepam et cæteros, qui cum illis Deo nobiscum serviunt, innocentes et puros pronunciamus; literis ad singulas parœcias missis, ut populi cujusque ecclesiæ cognoscant sui episcopi sinceritatem."

[3] Ibid. 767. "Hosius ab Hispania, Julius Romæ per Archidamum et Philoxenum presbyteros suos, Protogenes Sardicæ," &c.

[1] The emperor Constantine writes to him, calling him, pope. The same style of address, as you know, brethren, was used to all the primitive fathers who were bishops. Why it has become restricted to the bishop of Rome for so many centuries, instead of being, as it once was, the common title of all the metropolitans, is a question which your doctrine of supremacy must answer.

[2] Again, I remark an epistle addressed to sundry bishops by the presbyters and deacons under Athanasius, styling him the bishop of "the catholic Church of Alexandria."

Again, I find the terms in which Liberius and Rome are mentioned, rather inconsistent with your doctrine. For Athanasius, in his epistle to the hermits of Egypt, speaking of the persecuting spirit of the Arians, uses these words:

[3] "Nor truly did they spare Liberius, the Roman bishop, for they were led by no reverence, either because that was an apostolic see, or because Rome was the metropolis of the Roman power; nor did they remember that in their letters they had called them apostolic men; but confounding all together, they were equally forgetful of all, having no solicitude but for impiety alone."

Compare this with the terms Athanasius uses with regard to Hosius: [4] "Although they committed so many

[1] Ibid. 785. "Victor Constantinus Maximus Augustus, Papæ Athanasio."

[2] Ibid. 790. "Theogno, Mari, Macedonio, Theodoro, Ursacio, et Valenti Episcopis e Tyro profectis, presbyteri et diaconi sub reverendissimo Episcopo Athanasio, Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Alexandriæ."

[3] Ibid. S. Athan. ad solit. vitam agentes epist. Op. om. 1. 832. "Ne Liberio quidem Romano episcopo pepercerunt, nulla reverentia ducti, vel quod sedes illa Apostolica esset, vel quod Roma Metropolis esset Romanæ ditionis, neque recordati, se eos apostolicos viros in suis literis appellasse, sed omnia simul miscentes, æque omnium obliviscebantur, neque quicquam illis curæ, nisi sola impietas fuit."

[4] Ibid. 837. "Tantis ac talibus sceleribus factis, nihil omnino se adhuc fecisse arbitrabantur, quamdiu magnus ille Hosius eorum malitiam ex-

and so great iniquities, yet they thought they had done nothing, so long as that great man Hosius had not experienced their malice. For they studied to extend their rage towards even such as he: nor did they revere him as the *father of the bishops*, nor were they moved with shame on account of his being a confessor, nor did they regard his having discharged the episcopal office for more than sixty years: but despising all these considerations, they had their eyes intent only on their own heresy, truly regarding neither God nor man. Coming, accordingly, to Constantius, they address him in these words: We have done all things, we have driven into banishment the bishop of the Romans, and before him we had made exiles of many other bishops, we have filled every place with terror, nevertheless thy works are all vain, nor do we reckon that we have effected any thing, so long as Hosius is left. For while he acts among his followers, it seems as though all were acting in their Churches. He is the *prince of councils*, whatever he writes is heard of everywhere; he composed the formulary in the council of Nice, and continually traduces the Arians as heretics," &c.

From the whole of which, brethren, the following deductions seem to my mind irresistible.

pertus non esset. Nam in eum talem tantumque virum, suam rabiem protendere studuerunt; neque quod pater esset episcoporum, reveriti sunt; neque quod confessor erat, pudore moti sunt; neque quod sexagesimum annum et eo amplius in episcopatu agebat, respexerunt, sed omnia simul vilipendentes, ad solam suam hæresin oculos intentos habuere, homines revera neque Deum timentes neque hominem verentes. Adorti igitur Constantium talibus verbis alloquuntur, omnia quidem a nobis facta sunt, profligavimus in exilium Romanorum episcopum, et jam ante eum extorres fecimus quam plurimos episcopos, omnia loca terroribus implevimus, sed tamen pro nihilo sunt tanta tua opera, neque quicquam profecimus, quamdiu reliquus est Hosius. Quamdiu enim ille in suis agit, omnes in suis ecclesiis agere videntur. Hic princeps est Synodorum, et si quid scribit, ubique auditur: hic formulam fidei in Nicena synodo concepit, et Arianos ubique pro hæreticis traduxit," &c.

That the charge against Athanasius, which the council of Rome, with Julius, the bishop of Rome, at their head, had not authority sufficient to settle, was settled by the council of Sardis.

That this council, like the council of Nice, was convened, not by the bishop of Rome, but by the emperor.

That the bishop of Rome was present by his legates, Archidamus and Philoxenus, but the president of the council was Hosius, the same who presided in the council of Nice.

That the term pope was not restricted to the Roman bishop in the time of Athanasius; and the catholic Church of Alexandria was the proper form of speech, not the *Roman* catholic Church of Alexandria, as it would be set down at the present day.

That the regard paid to Rome was partly owing to its being an apostolic see, which reason applied to many Churches. But the other reason was of a secular character, since Athanasius censures the Arians for not respecting Rome, as *the metropolis of the Roman power*.

Lastly, the extraordinary esteem and reverence displayed towards the venerable Hosius, the father of bishops —the prince of councils, while there is not a word upon the point of Julius or Liberius possessing the vicegerency of Christ, the authority of the true God, the seat of Peter, the office of chief ruler and governor, or any intimation which looks like your subsequent doctrine, leaves the result of Athanasius' evidence clear and decisive, as it seems to my mind, in demonstration of the difference between the *primitive* Church of Rome, and her successor.

Perhaps, however, I ought not to close these extracts from Athanasius, without taking notice of the forgeries which have been palmed upon the world for some centuries under his name. Of these, two of the most impudent and barefaced appear to have been intended, not only

to supply the supposed deficiencies of this eminent father on the subject of the supremacy of Rome, but also to support the Roman additions to the canons of the Nicene council. They purport to be a letter of Athanasius and the Egyptian bishops, addressed to Marcus the pope, for fresh copies of the canons of this council, on the ground that the Arians had burned all their copies, with the answer of the pope, granting the request; and I doubt not that they were made to serve as important vouchers for those versions of the Nicene council which differ so widely from the original Greek text. I subjoin a few extracts of these letters from the Latin. I believe they are not extant in any other language.

[1] "To the holy and venerable lord Marcus, pope of the apostolic dignity, of the holy and apostolic see, and of the universal Church, Athanasius and all the bishops of Egypt send greeting." Then presently we have this expression, "by the authority of your holy see, which is the mother and head of all the Churches[2]."

The reply of the pope is framed according to the same model, being, no doubt, the work of the same hand.

[3] "To the venerable lords my brethren, Athanasius, and all the bishops of Egypt, Marcus, bishop of the holy apostolic and Roman see, and of the whole Church." Then we read of "the holy Roman Church which has always remained without spot, and, by the Providence of God, and through the help of the blessed apostle Peter,

[1] Athan. Op. om. 2. 623. "Domino sancto et apostolici culminis venerando Marco sanctæ Romanæ et apostolicæ sedis, atque universalis Ecclesiæ Papæ, Athanasius et universi Ægyptiorum Episcopi salutem."

[2] Ib. "Optamus, ut a vestræ sanctæ sedis Ecclesiæ autoritate, quæ est mater et caput omnium ecclesiarum," &c.

[3] Ibid. 624. "Dominis venerabilibus fratribus, Athanasio, et universis Ægyptiorum Episcopis, Marcus sanctæ Romanæ apostolicæque sedis, et universalis Ecclesiæ Episcopus."

will always remain the same[1]," and then we have the "holy and apostolic Church, the mother of all the Churches of Christ, which, by the grace of God, is proved never to have wandered from the track of apostolic tradition[2]."

You will do me the favour to recollect, brethren, that I have promised to take your own witnesses' statements, according to your own judgment of their authenticity. And it gives me pleasure to find the frank sincerity with which your eminent scholars unite in condemning these miserable forgeries; not always, perhaps, treating them with the severity they deserve, but showing a determination to do substantial justice in a spirit equally creditable to them, as lovers of Christian antiquity, and friends of truth.

From your own scholars, therefore, I take my warrant for condemning these epistles. For thus your famous cardinal Bellarmine speaks of them:

[3] "Concerning the epistles of Athanasius to pope Marcus, and of pope Marcus to Athanasius, it appears from the mere point of time, that *these epistles are suppositious*."

And Nannius, the learned translator of Athanasius, places them in the third class, of which he says: [4] "In this third class I have collected all the supposititious books, which I do *not think to be the work of Athanasius*."

[1] Ibid. "Sancta Romana Ecclesia, quæ semper immaculata mansit, et Domino providente, et beato Apostolo Petro opem ferente, in futuro manebit," &c.

[2] Ibid. 525. "Hæc sancta et Apostolica mater omnium Ecclesiarum Christi Ecclesia, quæ per omnipotentis Dei gratiam a tramite Apostolicæ traditionis nunquam errasse probatur," &c.

[3] Elogia S. Athan. in Præfat. Op. om. "De Epistolis Athanasii ad Marcum Papam, et Marci Papæ ad Athanasium, constat ex ratione temporis, eas epistolas esse supposititias."

[4] Athan. Op. om. Ep. Nuncupatoria. "In tertiam [classem] relegavi omnes supposititios libros, quos Athanasii non puto."

I shall waste neither your time nor my own, brethren, by commenting on this additional fraud upon the fathers. But I mention the fact as a matter of justice, not merely to Athanasius, but also to myself, and to you: to Athanasius, because these letters are no part of his testimony: to myself, because otherwise you might have supposed my quotations partial and unfair; and to you, partly lest you might overlook the mark of reprobation which your critics have affixed to these forgeries, and partly because it gives me real satisfaction to acknowledge such instances of candour. It only needs an extension of this candour, as it seems to me, to bring all our controversies to the point of concord and peace.

CHAPTER XXII.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

THE next writer presented to us in the order of time, is the eloquent Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, whose catechetical lectures are amongst the most interesting monuments of Christian antiquity. He flourished in the same century with Athanasius, and his works bear date about A. D. 345. From the Latin version of your own learned Touttée (except in a few places where I do not think him accurate, and which I have noted with the original, for your greater satisfaction), I proceed to extract the most important portions of his testimony in relation to St. Peter and the catholic Church. Of the bishop or Church of Rome he says nothing: although, as we shall see, his subject would naturally have led him to mention them, had he held your doctrine.

The first passage in which I find him speaking of Peter, is in the following language: [1] "The Lord is merciful,

[1] S. Cyril. Archiepis. Hierosol. cap. 11. § 19. Ed. Paris. A.D. 1720. p. 31. "Benignus est Dominus et ad condonandum promptus, tardus autem ad ulciscendum. Nemo igitur suam ipsius salutem desperet. Petrus apostolorum *summus et princeps*, coram vili ancillula ter Dominum negavit, sed pœnitudine tactus flevit amare," &c. The original Greek does not warrant this translation of the learned Touttée. Πέτρος ὁ κορυφαιότατος καὶ πρωτοστάτης τῶν ἀποστόλων, strictly means no more than, "Peter the *most leading* [Coryphæus] and *foremost* of the apostles."

and prompt to pardon, but slow to avenge. No one, therefore, need despair of salvation. Peter, the chief leader and foreman of the apostles, denied the Lord thrice before a poor maid-servant, but touched by repentance, he wept bitterly," &c.

Again, Cyril styles Peter the "foreman of the apostles, and the leading preacher of the Church[1]." That is, the preacher who took the lead; inasmuch as he preached the first sermon to the Jews, and, as in the case of Cornelius, he also may be said to have preached the first discourse to the Gentiles.

Again, Cyril mentions Peter along with Paul, in the following passages, where, arguing against the Jews, he contends for the superiority of the Christian over the Mosaic dispensation. [2] "Be not ashamed of your apostles," saith he, "for they are not inferior to Moses and the prophets, but they are good amongst the good, and better than the good. Elias truly was taken into heaven, but Peter has the keys of the kingdom of heaven, when he hears, *Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.* Elias was only taken up into heaven; but Paul was taken into heaven and into paradise (for it

In themselves, these words do not import any jurisdiction or authority over others; whereas a chief and a prince are persons bearing *rule* and *dominion*. The difference is obvious, and is altogether necessary to be well noted, in order to understand the Fathers rightly. I might add that there are two copies of this celebrated discourse of Cyril's extant, of which the second [see page 87. F.] has the same passage speaking of Peter, without any expletive whatever.

[1] Ibid. p. 150. [Cat. xi. § iii.] "Petrus apostolorum princeps et supremus Ecclesiæ præco," another case of strong amplification; for the Greek has it: Πέτρος ὁ πρωτοστάτης τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας κορυφαῖος κήρυξ, signifying, "Peter the *foremost* or *foreman* of the apostles, and the *leading preacher* of the Church;" certainly a very different pair of titles from the *prince* of the apostles and the *supreme* preacher of the Church.

[2] Ibid. Catechesis xiv. § 26. p. 218. "Non te tuorum pudeat apostolorum, non sunt Moyse deteriores, nec prophetis inferiores, sed boni sunt

was becoming that the disciples of Christ should receive an increase of favour), where he *heard unspeakable words which it was not lawful for man to utter.* Paul descended again, not because he was unworthy to inhabit the third heaven, but in order that the excellent gifts he had received should partake of his mortal lot, and that after he had descended with an accession of honour, and had preached Christ, and had endured death for his master's sake, he might also receive the crown of martyrdom." Here, although Cyril mentions St. Peter as having received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, yet he is contrasting him, not with the other apostles, but with Elias; and it is evident that, on the whole, he expresses himself more fully and warmly in favour of the privileges of St. Paul.

Again, I find St. Peter mentioned in the relation of the defeat sustained at Rome by the magician Simon. [1] "When his erroneous doctrine (Simon's) was diffusing itself more widely, that celebrated pair of men, Peter and Paul, the presidents of the Church, being arrived there, (i. e. at Rome) corrected the fault, and struck Simon with sudden death, at the moment that he was proudly exhibiting himself as if he thought he was a god. For

cum bonis, et bonis meliores. Nam Elias revera in cœlum adsumptus est, at Petrus habet claves regni cœlorum, cum audierit: *Quæcumque solveris super terram, erunt soluta in cœlis.* Elias in cœlum duntaxat est sublatus; Paulus vero et in cœlum et in paradisum, (decebat enim Jesu discipulos multiplicatam gratiam accipere,) *audivit ineffabilia verba quæ non licet homini loqui.* Descendit autem desursum Paulus, non quod tertii cœli habitatione indignus foret; sed ut perceptis humanam sortem superantibus donis, cumque honoris accessione descendens, cum Christum prædicasset, et mortem pro ipso toleravisset, martyrii quoque coronam adsequeretur."

[1] Ibid. Cat. vi. § 15. p. 96. "Cum vero error se latius spargeret, vitium illud correxit egregium par virorum, Petrus et Paulus, Ecclesiæ præsules illuc appulsi; Simonemque, illum videlicet opinione Deum, superbe se ostentantem, subita morte perculerunt. Nam cum pollicitus

Simon having promised that he would rise up on high into the air, and be borne through the air in a chariot of demons, these servants of God fell upon their knees, displaying that concord of which Jesus spake; *If two of you shall agree on any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them:* the weapon of this concord in prayer being launched against the magician, they cast him down to the earth. Nor should this thing seem wonderful to you, although, indeed, it be in itself admirable, for Peter was he who carried the keys of heaven. Nothing wonderful truly; since Paul was he who was taken into paradise and the third heaven, and heard mysterious words which it was not lawful for man to utter."

These passages contain the only statements which I have found in Cyril, capable of being interpreted in favour of your doctrine: and any intelligent mind can see how little they have to do with it. The strongest epithet applied to Peter—that of a president of the Church—is given to St. Paul in connexion with him. He is called a leader of the apostles—a foreman—a Coryphæus—but every one knows that these terms do not import *jurisdiction or dominion*, but simply a certain precedency among

esset Simon se sublimem in cœlos elatum iri, ac dæmonum vehiculo sublatus per aëra ferretur, genibus provoluti servi Dei, concordiamque illam demonstrantes, de qua Jesus dixerat: *Si duo ex vobis concordarint, de omni re quamcumque petierint, fiet eis:* concordiæ telo per precationem adversus magum immisso, præcipitem ad terram dejecerunt. Neque tibi res illa mira videatur, tametsi alioqui admiranda: Petrus namque erat is qui cœli claves circumferebat. Nihil quoque miri: Paulus enim erat is qui in tertium cœlum atque in paradisum raptus erat, audieratque arcana verba quæ non licet homini loqui." It is a little strange that your learned translator should give us a different version here from that which the former passages exhibited. Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος παραγενόμενοι, οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας προστάται. Peter and Paul together are properly enough called presidents of the Church, whereas Peter alone, when Cyril styled him only πρωτοστάτης, a term of much weaker signification, was called a prince.

equals. His having the keys of the kingdom of heaven is compared with Paul's being taken up into heaven; they are spoken of as being alike *personal* privileges, and there is nothing to warrant the inference that one was official, and designed to be transferred to successors, any more than the other. And there is not a word, in the last passage especially, where the defeat of Simon at Rome is mentioned, nor in any other part of Cyril's books, conveying the slightest allusion to St. Peter's having any government over the other apostles, or having established himself as bishop at Rome, or having contemplated the erection of one diocese, as a permanent superior over the rest of the Church.

But I proceed to make some other extracts from this writer, where it seems obvious to my mind that your doctrine could not have escaped some notice, had Cyril acknowledged it as a part of his system.

[1] "Christ," saith he, "is the High Priest, having a priesthood not to be transferred: who neither began to be a priest in time, nor has he another successor to his pontificate." Here there is nothing positively inconsistent with your doctrine, but yet it appears to me that the subject would naturally suggest the vicegerency of the pope, who bears the person and authority of the Redeemer; and who, though not the successor of Christ's pontificate, does nevertheless perform the same functions and claim the same powers, according to your system, which the successors of Christ, if he could have them, would properly exercise.

There is another short passage of Cyril, which has seemed to me worthy of some attention, on account of its indirect bearing. You know, brethren, that you recom-

[1] Ibid. Cat. x. § xiv. p. 143. "Christus autem est summus sacerdos, non transferendum habens sacerdotium: qui neque in tempore sacerdos esse cœpit, neque alterum habet pontificatus sui successorem."

mend your doctrine of the primacy, or rather the supremacy of Rome, because it is such a bond of union, and admirable preventive of schism. But we have already had occasion to notice how much the primitive Church was troubled with heresy and schism, and Cyril adds his testimony to the same melancholy evidence. For speaking of the coming of Antichrist, he enumerates the signs predicted in the Scripture, and acknowledges himself to be filled with alarm: "The wars among the nations," saith he, "terrify me; the schisms of the Churches terrify me, and the mutual hatred among brethren."[1] He assigns no cause for these schisms, which resembles your argument. He makes no allusion to that departure from the supposed see of Peter, which is the great occasion of schism according to your theory. He mourns over the evil, as you would do, but seems to have no idea of your notion, either as respects the cause of schism, or its remedy.

But I pass on to a beautiful paragraph, which has struck me as hardly reconcilable with your favourite dogma.[2] "The Holy Spirit," saith Cyril, "is great, om-

[1] Ibid. Cat. xv. § 18. p. 233. "Terrent me bella nationum, terrent ecclesiarum scissiones; terret mutuum fratrum odium."

[2] Ibid. Cat. xvi. § 22. p. 255. "Magnum quiddam, et omnipotens in donis, et admirabile, Spiritus Sanctus. Cogita quot nunc hic assidetis, quot animæ adsumus. Unicuique convenienter operatur, et medius adstans uniuscujusque compositionem videt, videt et cogitationem et conscientiam, quidque et loquamur et mente agitemus. Magnum quidem est id quod modo dixi, sed adhuc tenue. Consideres velim mente ab eo illustratus, quot sint totius hujusce parœciæ Christiani; quotquot totius provinciæ Palæstinæ. Rursus protende mentem ab hac provincia in totum Romanorum imperium; et ab hoc adspectum converte in mundum universum; Persarum genera, et Indorum nationes, Gothos et Sauromatas, Gallos Hispanosque, Mauros et Afros, et Æthiopas, et reliquos quorum nec nomina novimus: multi sunt enim populi, quorum ne ipsa quidem nomina ad notitiam nostram devenere. Conspice cujusque gentis episcopos, presbyteros, diaconos, monachos, virgines, et reliquos laicos: et

nipotent in gifts, and altogether admirable. Think how many of you are now seated before me, how many minds are here assembled together. The Holy Spirit works on each, and, standing in the midst, beholds the composition of each, sees the thought and the conscience, the subjects of our speech, and of our secret reflection. This that I have said, is great, but yet it is a light matter. I wish you whose minds he has illuminated, to consider further, how many Christians there are in this whole diocese, how many in the whole province of Palestine. Again, extend your mind from this province through the whole Roman empire, and from this turn to the whole world; the tribes of Persia, the nations of India, the Goths and Sarmatians, the Gauls and Spaniards, the Moors, and Africans, and Ethiopians, and the rest, of whom we do not even know the name: for there are many nations of whom the very names have not reached our notice. Look *at the bishops of each nation, the presbyters, the deacons, the monks, the virgins, and the rest of the laity*, and behold the great Ruler and superintendent of all, the bestower of gifts, how through the whole world he gives to one, modesty; to another, perpetual virginity; to another, pity; to another, zeal for the poor; to another, the power of resisting evil spirits; so that even as the sun, by one impulse of its rays, enlightens all things, so the Holy Spirit illumines those who possess spiritual vision."

Now here, brethren, I think that the scope of this fine passage seems to call for some notice of the papacy, if there were any such thing allowed in the days of Cyril. For he is professedly enumerating the operations of the

vide magnum rectorem ac præsidem donorumque largitorem; quomodo in omni mundo illi pudicitiam, isti perpetuam virginitatem, huic misericordiam, alii paupertatis studium, alteri adversantium spirituum effugandi vim adtribuit, et quemadmodum lux uno radii conjectu omnia collustrat, sic et Spiritus Sanctus eos qui oculos habent illuminat."

Holy Spirit in the Church, and to this end he reckons the bishops, the presbyters, the deacons, &c. of every nation. And would he omit the bishop of bishops, the ruler, the vicar of Christ, the governor who held the authority of the true God upon the earth, and whose administration of pastoral power over the whole Church needed far more of the guidance of the Holy Spirit than any of those whom Cyril mentions? To my mind it appears as unlikely that Cyril could thus enumerate the various ranks in the Church, and yet omit the pope, as that an historian should forget the king in describing a monarchy. I regard the passage, therefore, as furnishing strong circumstantial evidence against your doctrine.

Again, we find Cyril speaking of the apostles without distinction, when he saith, [1] "Christ imparted the communication of the Holy Ghost to his apostles, for it is written: And when he had said this, he breathed on them and said: Receive the Holy Ghost: Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted to them, and whose sins ye retain, they are retained." And he adds no intimation of your favourite distinction, by which Peter is constituted the head and pastor over his brethren.

On the other point which concerns the authority of Rome as the mistress and mother of all the Churches, I find your learned translator Touttée himself maintaining the claim of Jerusalem, with far greater reason, to be the mother Church. [2] "No one can deny," saith

[1] Ibid. Cat. xvii. § 12. p. 270. "Hujus Sancti Spiritus communicationem Apostolis impertivit, scriptum namque est: Et quum hoc dixisset, insufflavit, et dicit eis: Accipite Spiritum Sanctum: Quorumcumque remiseritis peccata, remittuntur eis; quorumcumque retinueritis, retenta sunt."

[2] Ibid. Appendix ad Cateches. v. p. 82. § 7. "Præcipuam esse Symboli Hierosolymitani authoritatem, nullus inficiari potest qui ad ista respexerit. 1. Hanc ecclesiam cæterarum omnium matrem esse; ibi

he, "that the authority of the symbol (or creed) of Jerusalem is chief, if he will consider the following. 1st. That this Church was *the mother of all the rest:* there was the fountain of ecclesiastical tradition, and the very cradle of the Christian religion. 2d. There, the ancient tradition would be more continually kept in memory, because of the very presence of the monuments of Christ and the apostles." The claim of Rome to be the *mistress* indeed, is not here impugned; but her favourite title of *mother* is most manifestly disputed.

We shall derive much greater satisfaction, however, from contemplating the description which Cyril gives us of the catholic Church, in his catechetical lecture on the very point. For the extract to which I shall next ask your attention, brethren, is on that clause of the creed: "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church."

[1] "The Church is called catholic," saith he, (or universal) "because it is diffused from the farthest bounds to the utmost limits of the earth. Also, because she teaches universally and without defect, all doctrines which ought to come under the notice of men, whether of visible and invisible, or of celestial and terrestrial things. Likewise, because she subjects to a right worship all ranks of men, princes and private individuals, the learned and the igno-

traditionis ecclesiasticæ fontem, et religionis Christianæ cunabula. 2. Ibi antiquam traditionem, præsentibus Christi et apostolorum monumentis, jugiter ad memoriam revocatam fuisse."

[1] Ibid. Cat. xviii. De Ecclesia Catholica, § 23. "Catholica enim vero (seu universalis) vocatur, eo quod per totum orbem ab extremis terræ finibus ad extremos usque fines diffusa est. Et quia universe et absque defectu docet omnia quæ in hominum notitiam venire debent dogmata, sive de visibilibus et invisibilibus, sive de cœlestibus et terrestribus rebus. Tum etiam eo quod omne hominum genus recto cultui subjiciat, principes et privatos, doctos et imperitos. Ac denique, quia generaliter, quidem omne peccatorum genus quæ per animam et corpus perpetrantur, curat et sanat, eadem vero omne possidet, quovis nomine significetur, virtutis genus, in factis et verbis et spiritualibus cujusvis speciei donis."

rant. And finally, because she cures and heals every kind of sin which is committed by the mind or by the body, and at the same time possesses every kind of virtue, by whatever name it may be known, whether in deeds or in words, or in spiritual gifts of every variety."

Thus much for the term CATHOLIC. Next let us hear Cyril on the word CHURCH. [1] "The psalmist truly," saith he, "had sung before: In the Church praise the Lord from the fountains of Israel. But since, on account of their treachery towards the Saviour, the Jews were cast away from favour, the Saviour built up a second from the Gentiles, our holy Church of Christians, of which he said to Peter: And on this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her. Of both these, David spake openly: of the first truly which was cut off: I hate the Church of the wicked: of the second which was to be built up, in the same psalm: O Lord, I have loved the honour of thy house; and presently in the following verses: In the Churches I will praise thee, O Lord. For that one which was in Judea being rejected,

[1] Ibid. § XXV. p. 297. "Prius quidem cecinerat Psalmista: *In ecclesia benedicite Deum Dominum ex fontibus Israel.* Ex quo vero propter structas adversus Salvatorem insidias, abjecti sunt a gratia Judæi; secundam ex gentibus ædificavit Servator, sanctam nostram Christianorum Ecclesiam, de qua dixit Petro: *Et super hanc petram ædificabo meam Ecclesiam, et portæ inferi non prævalebunt adversus eam.* De ambabus illis prophetans aperte dicebat David; de priori quidem quæ abjecta fuit; *Odio habui ecclesiam malignantium:* de secunda vero quæ ædificata est, in eodem Psalmo: *Domine, dilexi decorem domus tuæ;* et mox in consequentibus: *In ecclesiis benedicam te, Domine.* Rejecta namque una illa quæ in Judæa erat, per totum orbem deinceps Christi multiplicantur ecclesiæ, de quibus dictum est in Psalmis: *Cantate Domino canticum novum, laus ejus in ecclesia sanctorum.* Queis consentanea propheta Judæis dixit, *Non est mihi voluntas in vobis, dicit Dominus omnipotens.* Statimque subdit: *Propterea ab ortu solis usque ad occasum, nomen meum glorificatum est in gentibus.* De eadem sancta Catholica Ecclesia scribit ad Timotheum Paulus: *Ut scias quomodo oporteat in domo Dei versari, quæ est Ecclesia Dei viventis, columna et stabilimentum veritatis.*"

the Churches of Christ are thenceforward multiplied through the whole world, of which it is said in the Psalms: Sing unto the Lord a new song, his praise in the Church of the Saints. To which the prophet agreeing saith to the Jews: I have no will towards you, said the Almighty. And immediately he adds: From the rising of the sun even to the setting of the same, my name shall be glorified among the gentiles. Of the same holy catholic Church, Paul writes to Timothy: That you may know how to behave in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth."

[1] "But since," continues Cyril, "the name of Church is accommodated to various things, as of the multitude which was in the theatre of Ephesus, it is written: And when he had said thus, he dismissed the Church (or assembly): properly and truly it may be said that the Church of the wicked is the assembly of heretics, I say, of the Marcionites, the Manicheans, and the rest: therefore now the faith delivers it to you to be most carefully

[1] Ib. § xxvi. "Quoniam vero Ecclesiæ nomen diversis accommodatur rebus, ut et de multitudine quæ in theatro Ephesiorum erat, scriptum est: Et quum hæc dixisset, dimisit ecclesiam, (seu concionem) proprie autem et vere quis dixerit *ecclesiam malignantium* esse hæreticorum cœtus, Marcionistarum dico, et Manichæorum reliquorumque: idcirco nunc cautissime tibi tradidit fides ita tenendum: ET IN UNAM SANCTAM CATHOLICAM ECCLESIAM; eorum abominanda collegia fugiens, adhæreas semper sanctæ Catholicæ Ecclesiæ, in qua et renatus es. Et si quando peregrinatus fueris in civitatibus, ne simpliciter requiras ubi sit Dominicum; (i. e. Ecclesiæ et sacri conventus ædes)—nam et cæterœ impiorum sectæ atque hæreses, suas ipsorum speluncas Dominicorum nomine honestare nituntur;—neque ubi sit Ecclesia; sed ubi sit *Catholica* Ecclesia; hoc enim proprium nomen est hujus sanctæ, et matris omnium nostrum, quæ quidem et sponsa est Domini nostri Jesu Christi unigeniti filii Dei, (scriptum est enim: Sicut et Christus dilexit Ecclesiam, et semetipsum tradidit pro ea, et omnia quæ consequuntur:) et figuram præ se fert atque imitationem *Superioris Hierusalem quæ libera est, et mater omnium nostrum.* Quæ quum prius sterilis fuerit, nunc est numerosæ prolis parens."

preserved, AND IN ONE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH, in order that you may avoid the abominable assemblies of these men, and may adhere always to the holy catholic Church, in which you were regenerated. And if you travel sometimes in the cities, do not simply ask for the Lord's house—for the sects of the impious and the heretics endeavour to dignify their caverns by the name of the Lord's house,—nor yet inquire merely where is the Church; but where is the *catholic* Church; for this is the proper name of that holy mother of us all, which truly is the spouse of our Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God (for it is written, Like as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it, with all that follows); and she bears the figure and image of that Jerusalem above, which is free, and is the mother of us all. Who, although she was barren, is now the parent of a numerous seed."

[1] "The first, then, being repudiated, in the second, namely, the catholic Church, God, as saith St. Paul, placed first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, afterwards powers, then the gifts of healing, helps, governments, divers kinds of tongues, and every kind of virtue; wisdom and understanding, temperance and justice, mercy and humanity, and patience not to be overcome by persecutions. Which, truly, by the armour of righteousness, on the right hand and on the left, by

[1] Ib. § xxvii. p. 298. "Priore namque repudiata, in secunda, catholica videlicet Ecclesia, *Deus*, uti Paulus ait, *posuit primum apostolos, secundo prophetas, tertio doctores, postea potestates, tum gratias curationum, opitulationes, gubernationes, genera linguarum*, et omnem cujuslibet virtutis speciem: Sapientiam dico et intelligentiam, temperantiam et justitiam, misericordiam et humanitatem, insuperabilemque in persecutionibus patientiam. Quæ quidem *per arma justitiæ dextra ac sinistra, per gloriam et ignominiam*, primum in persecutionibus et angustiis sanctos martyres diversis et multiplici flore nexis patientiæ coronis redimivit; nunc vero in pacis temporibus, Dei gratia debitos honores recipit a regibus, et viris dignitatum sublimitate conspicuis, et omni denique hominum genere ac

honour and dishonour, at first in persecutions and sorrows, adorned her holy martyrs with divers crowns woven with many a flower of patience; but now, in times of peace, receives, by the favour of God, due honour from kings, and men conspicuous for their high dignity, and from every kind and species of men. For the kings of the nations, distributed in divers places, have limits to their power: it is the holy catholic Church alone which through the whole world enjoys an unlimited power. Since God, as it is written, has placed peace for her boundary. Of which if I were to declare every thing, my discourse must be continued for many hours."

I have given you this long extract, brethren, from the admirable Cyril, in order to show the striking difference between his description of the catholic Church, in the middle of the fourth century, and the definition presented by your expositors at the present day. For while we behold your Doway catechism, in its exposition of the creed, obliging every child to say that the Church "is the congregation of all the faithful under Jesus Christ, their invisible head, *and his vicar upon earth, the pope*,"—while it defines the essential parts of the Church to be "*a pope or supreme head*, bishops, pastors, and laity,"—while it teaches that from "*the pope and general councils we have our spiritual life and motion* as we are Christians," and that the man who has not a due subordination and connexion to these *must needs be dead, and not accounted a member of the Church*,"—Cyril, expounding the same creed, describing the parts of the Church, and speaking largely on all that is most important to a true understanding of

specie. Quumque reges distributarum diversis locis gentium, suæ potestatis limites habeant; sola est sancta Catholica Ecclesia, quæ per orbem totum indeterminata gaudet potestate. *Posuit* enim *Deus*, ut scriptum est, *terminum ejus pacem*. De qua si omnia dicere vellem, multarum mihi horarum habenda esset oratio."

the HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH, says not one word of pope or council; nor does he, in the whole of his admirable discourses, afford even an allusion to the existence of such a dominion as you claim, over the vast extent of Christendom.

But before I dismiss this witness, let me present to you a short extract, to show, that although he took no note of pope or council, he knew how to value the Scriptures. Thus, in one place, he saith, [1] "Are not the divine Scriptures our salvation?" And again, [2] "Let us, therefore," saith he, "declare concerning the Holy Spirit, only those things which are written: but if there be any thing unwritten, let us not curiously pry into it. The Holy Ghost himself dictated the Scriptures; he also declared concerning himself whatever he chose, or we were able to receive. Let us say, therefore, those things which have been said by him: for whatever he has not said we dare not."

Alas, brethren! how little did this great luminary of the primitive Church know of the modern boundaries of faith, when he thus confined it to the word of God recorded in the Scriptures, instead of looking for the same dictates of inspiration in the decrees of councils, and attributing equal infallibility to the catholic Church. Remember, I beseech you, that Cyril flourished in the very next generation after the council of Nice; that Macarius, the patriarch of Jerusalem, and eighteen bishops of Palestine, had assisted at it; that the controversy with the

[1] Ib. Cat. xii. § 16. p. 170. "Nonne divinæ scripturæ sunt salus nostra?"

[2] Ib. Cat. xvi. § 2. p. 243, 4. "Dicamus igitur nos de Spiritu Sancto ea tantum quæ scripta sunt: si quid vero scriptum non fuerit, ne curiose scitemur. Ipse Spiritus Sanctus eloquutus est scripturas: ipse de seipso quoque dixit quæcumque voluit, seu quæcumque capere potuimus. Dicamus ergo quæ ab ipso dicta sunt: nam quæ ille non dixit, nos non audemus."

Arians and Semi-Arians continued throughout his own day, and gave him no small disturbance, so that, like Athanasius, he had all imaginable reason to magnify the authority of this council, and place its decrees on the highest ground. Yet nothing of the kind does he any where intimate; but, on the contrary, limits the dictates of the Holy Spirit to the Scriptures alone.

Perhaps I ought not to close this chapter without some notice of the frauds which here, as in almost every ancient father, have exercised the judgment and drawn forth the honest reprobation of your own critics. One of these frauds seems to have been either committed or adopted by your celebrated doctor Thomas Aquinas, in order to aid the power of the pope in the Greek controversy. [1] "Thus," saith Thomas, "Cyril, the patriarch of Jerusalem, declares, speaking in the person of Christ to Peter: *Thou for a while, and I for ever, with all whom I shall set in thy place: fully and perfectly, with the sacrament and with authority, will I be with them, as I am with thee.*" "Launoy," observes Touttée candidly, "in the epistle which he wrote to Paul Ratuy, where he examines many *similar testimonies* adduced by St. Thomas in his work against the errors of the Greeks, proves this passage also to be spurious." And in his learned and elaborate Dissertation, where he speaks of some other forgeries on the name of Cyril, he uses this strong language. [2] "But that which an ignorant and imprudent

[1] Ibid. p. 388. "*Item Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus,*" saith S. Thomas, "*patriarcha dicit ex persona Christi loquens,*" [ad Petrum:] 'Tu cum fine, et ego sine fine cum omnibus quos loco tui ponam: plene et perfecte, sacramento et authoritate cum eis ero, sicut sum et tecum.' Launoius epistola ad Paulum Ratuynum Parisiensem Theologum, qua multa similia excutit testimonia, a sancto Thoma in opusculo contra errores Græcorum objecta, hujus quoque *νοθείαν* probat."

[2] Ibid. Dissertatio de Cataches. S. Cyril. cap. 1. p. xcv. "Sed omnem fere impudentiam vincit, quod inscitus et imprudens nebulo Augustini ad Cyrillum, et Cyrilli ad Augustinum epistolas finxit de obitu et miraculis

knave has feigned of epistles from Augustin to Cyril, and Cyril to Augustin, concerning the death and miracles of Jerome, excels every thing else in impudence; and I have doubted whether, instead of committing it to the press, I ought not rather to have committed it to the flames. The argument in favour of printing it, however, prevailed; lest any thing should be omitted in the work, which might be desired; and that by this one example it should be shown how much could be done by lying. *Of the same chaff is the fragment cited by S. Thomas, under the name of Cyril.*"

Brethren, I cite this passage not only that I may do credit to the honest indignation expressed by upright minds amongst yourselves, when forced to speak of the shameful frauds committed and tolerated so long upon the venerated authors of the purer ages, but also for the sake of its bearing on what we assume to be genuine. That the writings of the fathers are yet sufficiently expurgated, who can assure us? The fact that a writer so profound and so justly celebrated as Thomas Aquinas could either have been himself so deceived, or so willing to deceive, is one which you will not read without mortification and sorrow. And when we consider that your whole fabric of ecclesiastical polity and peculiar faith is supported by appeals to the remains of antiquity, from which it costs your own brightest scholars so much toil to cleanse away the foul rubbish of imposture, can you wonder that we ask you to examine them anew? Admiring, as warmly as yourselves, the pure gold of the ancient Church, are not our best efforts well spent in separating it from the alloy of unauthorized innovation?

S. Hieronymi: quæ quidem flammis digniora quam typis num recuderem dubitavi. Vicit tamen sententia, ne in hoc opere desiderarentur, ut hoc uno exemplo, quantum mendacio licuerit declararetur. Ejusdem furfuris est fragmentum a S. Thoma sub nomine Cyrilli citatum."

CHAPTER XXIII.

Brethren in Christ,

The next name on the list of witnesses is Hilary, the bishop of Poictiers, whose works may be set down about the year 350. A considerable number of passages occur in this writer, which I shall proceed to place before you in their own integrity; beginning with those which seem most in favour of your doctrine.

In his treatise on the Trinity, he introduces, in a fine address to Christ, a sketch of the sacred history, speaking of Moses, and David, Solomon, and the prophets, and then proceeds to say, [1] "Matthew, chosen from a publican to be an apostle; John, through the kind familiarity of the Lord, thought worthy of a revelation of heavenly mysteries; *Simon, blessed after the acknowledgment of the mystery*," (i. e. the mystery of the incarnation,) "*lying beneath the foundation of the Church and receiving the keys*

[1] Hil. De Trinitat. lib. vi. Ed. Paris. 1652. p. 110. "Electus ex publicano Matthæus in apostolum, et ex familiaritate Domini revelatione cœlestium mysteriorum dignus Joannes, et post sacramenti confessionem beatus Simon ædificationi ecclesiæ subjacens, et claves regni cœlestis accipiens, et reliqui omnes Spiritu Sancto prædicantes, et ex persequutore apostolus vas electionis tuæ Paulus, in profundo maris vivens, in cœlo tertio homo in paradiso ante martyrium, in martyrio perfectæ fidei consummata libatio. Ab his ergo quæ teneo edoctus sum, his immedicabiliter imbutus sum. Et ignosce, omnipotens Deus, quia in his nec emendari possum, et commori possum."

of the celestial kingdom, and all the rest preaching by the Holy Spirit, and Paul, from a persecutor made an apostle of thine election, living in the depth of the sea, a mortal in the third heaven, in paradise before martyrdom, the offering of a perfect faith being consummated by martyrdom. By these I am instructed in the doctrines which I hold, with these I am unalterably imbued. And forgive me, Almighty God, for adding, that in these I am not able to improve, but am able to die."

It is perfectly evident that Hilary, in enumerating the privileges of the apostles after this manner, makes no allusion to the point for which you cite the words I have italicised. For the question is not whether St. Peter was blessed, whether he lay beneath the foundation of the Church, or whether he received the keys of the kingdom of heaven. But these are the questions to be decided: Did Peter receive any power of jurisdiction or government over the other apostles, and was that power transferred to the bishops of Rome? on neither of which points does this, your favourite passage, shed a ray of light. Taken by itself, brethren, in the manner customary with your writers, and aptly introduced when the mind of your reader is prepared to give it the desired construction, it may, indeed, be made to look like evidence on your side. But taken in its real connexion, it is manifest that Hilary has here said nothing to support your doctrine.

The next passage, however, amounts to a positive demonstration of his meaning. Hilary is commenting on the apparent difficulty presented by the apostles saying, on the night in which their Lord was betrayed: "Now we know that thou knowest all things. By this we believe that thou hast come out from God." And he addresses them, rhetorically, in these words: [1] "You," saith he,

[1] Ibid. p. 118. E. "Tanta et tam Deo propria, vos, O sancti et beati viri, ob fidei vestræ meritum claves regni cœlorum sortiti, et ligandi

"O holy and blessed men, who had seen so many things only suitable to God, performed by our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, and who, *on account of the merit of your faith, obtained the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the right of binding and loosing in heaven and in earth*, do you protest that you now, for the first time, understood the truth, that the Saviour had come forth from God?" In this passage Hilary admits, in the plainest terms, that the privileges of Peter were equally the property of all the apostles; and of course we cannot do justice to his testimony if we put a different comment on the other.

Again, I find our witness declaring, that not Peter, *but the faith which he confessed*, was the foundation of the Church: just as we have seen the same sentiment in the other fathers, and shall, by and by, see it in many more. He is addressing himself to the Arians, who maintained that Christ was a creature. [1] "Peter," saith he, "confessed Christ to be the Son of God: but at this day, you, the lying priesthood of a new apostolate, cast forth Christ as being a creature from nothing. What force do you give to these glorious sayings? Confessing the Son of God, for this he was blessed. *This is the revelation of the Father, this is the foundation of the Church*, this is the security of eternity, from this are the keys of the kingdom of heaven, from this his earthly judgments are accounted heavenly."

atque solvendi in cœlo et in terra jus adepti, gesta esse per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum Dei filium videratis; et ad id quod a Deo exisse se dixit, nunc primum vos veri intelligentiam assequi protestamini?"

[1] Ibid. 121. F. "Ille (i. e. Petrus) confessus est Christum filium Dei: at mihi tu hodie novi apostolatus mendax sacerdotium ingeris Christum ex nihilo creaturam. Quam vim affers dictis gloriosis? Filium Dei confessus, ob hoc beatus est. Hæc revelatio Patris est, hoc ecclesiæ fundamentum est, hæc securitas æternitatis est, hinc regni cœlorum habet clavem, hinc terrena ejus judicia cœlestia sunt."

He pursues his argument in the following animated strain: [1] "Let there be, truly, another faith, if there be any other keys of the kingdom of heaven. Let there be another faith, if there is another Church to come, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. Let there be another faith, if there is to be another apostolate, able to bind and loose in heaven, what had been bound and loosed on earth. Let there be another faith, if Christ, the Son of God, is to be preached as being other than he is. But if this only faith which confessed Christ to be the Son of God, merited the glory of all the beatitudes in Peter, it must needs be, that the faith which only confesses him to be rather a creature, out of nothing, cannot obtain the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and being constructed neither with apostolic faith nor with apostolic virtue, there can be neither Church nor Christ connected with it."

There is another passage, which seems better suited to your doctrine, though, in truth, it presents no difficulty. Speaking of the cure of Peter's mother-in-law, and expounding it rather mystically, Hilary observes: [1] "For he first believed, and is the beginning of the apostolate." The word which I have here translated beginning, is

[1] Ibid. 122. D. "Sit sane fides alia, si aliæ claves regni cœlorum sunt. Sit fides alia, si ecclesia alia est futura, adversum quam portæ inferi non prævalebunt. Sit fides alia, si erit alius apostolatus, ligata et soluta per se in terra ligans in cœlo atque solvens. Sit fides alia, si Christus filius Dei alius præterquam qui est, prædicabitur. Sin vero hæc sola fides confessa Christum Dei filium, omnium beatitudinum gloriam meruit in Petro; necesse est, ut ea quæ creaturam potius ex nihilo confitebitur, claves regni cœlorum non adepta, et extra fidem ac virtutem apostolicam constituta, nec ecclesia sit ulla, nec Christus."

[2] Ibid. Com. in Mat. p. 524. D. "Nam primus credidit, et apostolatus est princeps." It may be observed that the phrase *princeps Ecclesiæ*, a prince of the Church, occurs to denote a bishop in the eighth book of Hilary's Treatise on the Trinity, p. 158. D. Speaking of St. Paul's instructions to Titus, he saith: "Non enim Apostolicus sermo probitatis honestatisque præceptis hominem tantum sæculo conformat ad vitam,

Princeps, which also signifies a prince, a ruler, and a governor. Hence, in your quotations of the passage, your writers give it: *Princeps apostolorum*, PRINCE OF THE APOSTLES. But you know, perfectly well, brethren, that the word *princeps* has the meaning of *first, original, primitive*, for its primary signification, in all our lexicons. Its secondary meaning is *chief, principal;* and it is only in its third meaning that it bears the sense of *prince* or *princess, emperor, chieftain, governor, ruler*, &c. Hence, it is not doing justice to Hilary, nor to the other fathers, to confine this word to that single meaning, which the modern languages of Europe have derived from it. More especially would this be indefensible when Hilary says not, *Princeps apostolorum*, The PRINCE OF THE APOSTLES, but *Princeps apostolatus*, The beginning of the APOSTOLATE, *i. e.* the apostolic office, which could not properly exist until the apostles knew that Christ was the Son of God, because no man could be an apostle under the Gospel dispensation, until he was enabled to preach the fundamental doctrine of the Gospel. I beg your candid attention, brethren, to these remarks, in the firm persuasion, that the great bulk of your supposed authority for Peter's jurisdiction, in the writings of the fathers, rests on this limited and unclassical rendering of the word *princeps*, which, in its first two meanings, expresses what we all allow; and which can only be made to serve your purpose by tying it down to its third signification, against the whole strain of their other testimony.

I proceed to set before you the rest of Hilary's evidence upon the point in question. "[1] The confession of

neque rursum per doctrinæ scientiam scribam synagogæ instituit ad legem: sed *perfectum Ecclesiæ principem perfectis maximarum virtutum bonis instituit, ut et vita ejus ornetur docendo, et doctrina vivendo.*" In all cases of words admitting of more than one meaning, the subject matter and the context must solve the difficulty.

[1] Ibid. 572. E. "Et dignum plane confessio Petri præmium consecuta

Peter," saith he, "obtained a worthy reward, for that he saw the Son of God in man. Blessed was he who was praised, inasmuch as his eyes saw and beheld beyond human nature, not beholding that which was of flesh and blood, but discerning the Son of God by the revelation of his heavenly Father; and judged worthy, who first acknowledged what was of God in Christ. *O happy foundation of the Church in the declaration of this new name:* a rock worthy of that building, which should loose the infernal laws, and the gates of hell, and all the bars of death. O happy door-keeper of heaven, to whose will the keys of the eternal porch are delivered, of which the earthly judgment is a prejudicated authority in heaven, that those things which are bound or loosed on earth may obtain in heaven a like condition."

To make this passage consistent with the rest of Hilary's testimony, it would be necessary to understand it as spoken of the faith rather than of the person of Peter. And yet it is evident, that even if it were spoken of him personally, it would still avail nothing to the support of your doctrine, because I have already quoted the declaration of the same witness, asserting the same privileges of all the apostles.

Again, we read, in the same work of Hilary:[1] "This

est, quia Dei Filium in homine vidisset. Beatus hic est, qui ultra humanum oculos intendisse et vidisse laudatus est: non id quod ex carne et sanguine erat contuens, sed Dei Filium cœlestis Patris revelatione conspiciens: dignusque judicatus, qui quod in Christo Dei esset, primus agnosceret. O in nuncupatione novi nominis felix Ecclesiæ fundamentum: dignaque ædificatione illius petra, quæ infernas leges, et tartari portas, et omnia mortis claustra dissolveret. O beatus cœli janitor, cujus arbitrio claves æterni aditus traduntur, cujus terrestre judicium præjudicata autoritas sit in cœlo: ut quæ in terris aut ligata sint aut soluta, statuti ejusdem conditionem obtineant et in cœlo."

[1] Ibid. 565. Com. in Mat. "Et hoc in Petro considerandum est, fide eum cæteris anteisse. Nam ignorantibus cæteris, primus respondit: Tu es filius Dei vivi. Primus passionem, dum malum putat, detestatus est.

is to be considered in Peter, that he *preceded the others in faith.* For while the others were still ignorant, he first answered: Thou art the Son of the living God. He first expressed his abhorrence of the passion of Christ, while he thought it evil. He first asserted, that he was ready to die for his Lord, and that he would not deny him. He first refused to have his feet washed. He drew a sword, also, against those who took his Lord. But at his" (I suppose Christ's) "ascent into the ship, the wind and the sea were calmed: by the return of their serenity, the eternal peace and tranquillity of the Church is indicated. And because then he came, (in power) so manifest, they all, justly astonished, said; Truly he is the Son of God."

This passage is one of many, which explains what the ancients meant by Peter's primacy. He was first, *primus*, in order of time, to profess his faith; therefore he was the first to receive the assurance of the consequent blessing. I have set forth the context of these passages at large, for the purpose of shewing you, brethren, that Hilary did not connect his praise of Peter with any idea of pastoral power or government over his fellow apostles; still less, with any notion of an official jurisdiction to be passed down to his successors in the Church of Rome. We shall see, presently, more proof, that such a doctrine had no place in the system of Hilary.

For listen to him, commenting on the 118th Psalm: "[1] What is thy portion, O Peter? Thou hadst renounced

Primus et moriturum se, et non negaturum spopondit. Primus lavari sibi pedes prohibuit. Gladium quoque adversus eos, qui Dominum comprehendebant, eduxit. Ascensu autem ejus in navim, ventum et mare esse sedatum: post claritatis suæ reditum, æterna ecclesiæ pax et tranquillitas indicatur. Et quia tum manifestus adveniet, recte admirantes universi loquuti sunt: *Vere filius Dei est.*"

[1] Ibid. p. 890. Enar. in Psalm. cxviii. "Quid est, Petre, istud quod possides? Renunciaveras omnibus, Deo tuo dicens: Ecce nos omnia

all things, saying to thy Lord: Behold we have left all and have followed thee, what shall we have therefore? And he had answered: Amen I say unto you, that you who have followed me in the regeneration, shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel: and others, at your example, leaving all things, he had promised that they should receive an hundred fold, and afterwards, eternal life."

"What then, Peter, is thy portion. Thou hast, though I do not dare to say more than an hundred fold, nevertheless I say that thy possessions are beyond calculation. For thou sayest: What I have, I give unto thee, in the name of Jesus Christ, arise and walk. O happy possession! O perfect portion of God! Thou dost not dispense earthly treasure, but thou makest amends for the work of nature; and restorest the condemned parts of a deformed birth. Thou orderest a man born lame, to walk, and incitest a man of many years to leap with vigour. He bestows this wealth, whose portion is God. And Paul knows the glories of his riches, saying; God forbid that I should glory, unless in the cross of Jesus Christ, my Lord," &c.

If Hilary, brethren, had professed your notions, would

dereliquimus, et secuti sumus te, quid erit nobis? Et tibi ille responderat: Amen dico vobis, quod vos qui secuti estis me, in regeneratione sedebitis super duodecim thronos judicantes duodecim tribus Israeli. Et exemplo vestro cæteris relinquentibus cuncta spoponderat, quod et centuplum acciperent, et dehinc vitam æternam possessuri essent. Quid est igitur istud, Petre, quod habes? Habes plane, et non audeo dicere plus te centuplo obtinere, dico tamen te sine multiplicatione calculi possidere. Dicis enim: Quod habeo, hoc tibi do, in nomine Jesu Christi surge et ambula. O felix possessio! O perfecta Dei portio! Non terrena largiris, sed naturæ opus rependis: et vitiosi partus damna restauras. Claudum natum ingredi jubes, et multæ ætatis virum incessu rudi incitas. Has opes tribuit, cujus Deus portio est. Novit et Paulus divitiæ suæ glorias, dicens: Mihi autem absit gloriari, nisi in cruce Domini mei Jesu Christi," &c.

he, in thus setting forth the *portion* of Peter, have passed by that peculiar portion in which none of the other apostles shared, viz. *the plenitude of power, as the ruler of them all?*

Again, in his comment on the 51st Psalm, Hilary repeats the declaration that "[1] the *apostles*," (not Peter only,) "obtained the keys of the heavens." And in his books on the Trinity he calls St. Paul "the *master* of the nations,"—"The chosen *doctor* of the nations,"—And again: "The *elect master* of the Church[2]." These titles would far better suit your hypothesis, than any thing which Hilary says of Peter. Indeed the latter would be precisely to the point, if the subject were not the wrong apostle.

One extract more from the writings of Hilary may serve to complete his testimony. It is from his epistle to the emperor Constantius, complaining of his exile, deploring the distracted state of the Church, and referring the emperor to Scripture for the truth of the orthodox doctrine on the Trinity. In my opinion, it exhibits clearly the polity of the Church, and the small regard paid to councils, in the days of Hilary.

[3] "I am a bishop," saith he, addressing the emperor, "in the communion of all the Churches and bishops of Gaul, although continuing in exile, and as yet distributing

[1] Ibid. In Psalm. li. Enar. p. 706. "Apostoli cœlorum claves sortiti sunt."

[2] Ibid. De Trinit. lib. vi. p. 125. D. "Non incerta et infirma ille, qui electionis est vas, locutus est: Nec Magister gentium, et Apostolus Christi ambiguæ doctrinæ suæ errorem reliquit."

Ibid. lib. vii. p. 158. F. "Non ignoravit doctor hic gentium, et ex conscientia loquentis atque habitantis in se Christi Ecclesiæ electus magister."

[3] Ad Constantium Augustum liber. Ibid. p. 341. "Episcopus ego sum in omnium Gallicarum Ecclesiarum atque episcoporum communione, licet in exilio permanens, et Ecclesiæ adhuc per presbyteros meos communionem distribuens. Exulo autem non crimine, sed factione, et falsis nunciis synodi apud te Imperatorem pium," &c.

the communion of the Church though my presbyters. But I am banished not through crime, but through faction, and by false messengers of the council deceiving thee, most pious emperor," &c.

[1] "Dangerous, as well as miserable is our condition," continues our author, "now that there are as many creeds as wills, as many doctrines as manners, and as many causes of blasphemy as vices, whilst our faith is written as we choose, or as we choose is interpreted. And although, since there is one God, and one Lord, and one baptism, there should be one faith, we cut off a part from that only faith; and while we make many creeds, we begin to approach that state where there is none. For we are conscious amongst ourselves, that since the council of Nice, nothing has been written but creeds. It is a battle about God in words, while there is a dispute about novelties, while there is a falling into snares through ambiguities, while there is a quarrel about authors, and a conflict about studies, while there is difficulty in consent, while one begins to pronounce

[1] Ibid. 343. "Periculosum nobis admodum, atque etiam miserabile est, tot nunc fides existere, quot voluntates: et tot nobis doctrinas esse quot mores: et tot causas blasphemiarum pullulare, quot vitia sunt: dum aut ita fides scribuntur, ut volumus, aut ita ut volumus, intelliguntur. Et cum secundum unum Deum et unum Dominum, et unum baptisma, fides una sit, excidimus ab ea fide quæ sola est: et dum plures fiunt, ad id cœperunt esse, ne ulla sit. Conscii enim nobis invicem sumus, post Niceni conventus synodum nihil aliud quam fidem scribi. Deum in verbis pugna est, dum de novitatibus quæstio est, dum de ambiguis occasio est, dum de autoribus querela est, dum de studiis certamen est, dum in consensu difficultas est, dum alter alteri anathema esse cœpit: prope jam nemo Christi est. Incerto cum doctrinarum vento vagamur; et aut dum docemus, perturbamus; aut dum docemur, erramus. Jam vero proximi anni fides, quid jam de immutatione in se habet? Primum quæ homousion decernit taceri: sequens rursum, quæ homousion decernit et prædicat. Tertium deinceps, quæ usiam. simpliciter a patribus præsumptam, per indulgentiam excusat. Postremum quartum, quæ non excusat, sed condemnat."

anathema against another; already we are near the point when no one is of Christ. We are driven about by an uncertain wind of doctrines, and either we trouble others while we instruct, or we err while we are instructed. Already it may be asked, whether the creed of the last year has any thing immutable about it? First there is a council which decrees that the word consubstantial should be disused: then another which decrees and preaches this same consubstantiality: afterwards a third, which excuses the word substance by way of indulgence, inasmuch as it was taken in simplicity from the fathers; lastly a fourth, which excuses not, but condemns it."

I pass on however to the conclusion of Hilary's introductory address, where, with honest boldness, he claims the attention of the emperor on a different ground from the decrees of councils[1]. "Hear," saith he, "I ask, those things which are written concerning Christ, lest, instead of these, those things which are not written should be preached. Submit your ears to what I shall say to you, from the sacred books. You may raise your faith to God. Hear what is profitable for faith, for unity, for eternity. I shall set before you, with due respect towards your kingdom and your faith, all those things which may benefit the peace both of the East and of the West; under the public conscience, under contending councils, under notorious strife. I give you beforehand, mean-

[1] Ibid. p. 345. D. "Audi, rogo, ea quæ de Christo sunt scripta, ne sub eis ea quæ non scripta sunt prædicentur. Summitte ad ea, quæ de libris locuturus sum, aures tuas: fidem tuam ad Deum erigas. Audi, quod proficit ad fidem, ad unitatem, ad æternitatem. Locuturus sum tecum cum honore regni et fidei tuæ, omnia ad orientis et occidentis pacem profutura; sub publica conscientia, sub synodo dissidente, sub lite famosa. Præmitto interim pignus futuri apud te sermonis mei. Non aliqua ad scandalum, neque quæ extra Evangelium sunt, defendam," &c.

while, a pledge of my future discourse; I shall support nothing for the sake of scandal, nor any thing which goes beyond the Gospel."

To my mind, brethren, the state of things disclosed in these extracts is at utter variance with your present polity. For if the bishop of Rome had then been acknowledged the supreme judge of all religious causes, according to your system, how could Hilary have been banished by faction, through the arts of false messengers sent *from the council to the emperor?* If the pope were then what you hold him to be now, why did not Hilary appeal to him, and cite before his tribunal the disturbers of his diocese? Or at least, why does he not tell the emperor something about the true system of apostolical government, and remind him that he ought not to suffer a bishop to be banished, until he had the sanction of the pope of Rome, the successor of Peter, who held "the authority not of a mere man, but of the true God upon the earth," in the words of your canon law? Is it credible that a banished bishop, seeking the favour of his prince, and believing that *by divine right* the pope of Rome was what you declare him to be, could omit all allusion to the official prerogatives of this chief ruler of Christ's Church on such an occasion, and write as if there were no earthly governor or supreme judge over the people of God?

But this extract shews, further, the miserable distractions of the Church, and the total inefficiency of councils to command acquiescence or general consent. How does this consist with your doctrine, that in the judgment of the fathers, a general council, approved by the pope, was an infallible director, being the special organ of the Holy Ghost? Where does Hilary speak in such a strain of the council of Nice? Does he not, on the contrary, make light of all these councils, speak of them all with the same apparent disapprobation, and

instead of telling the emperor that the Nicene synod was infallible, does he not pledge himself to confine his argument to the Scriptures alone? Most manifest, then, brethren, does it seem to my mind, that Hilary knew nothing of either of these points which are now considered by you as fundamental, viz. the supreme authority of the pope, and the infallibility of general councils. So that on the whole, I consider this witness as a decided adversary to the antiquity and apostolical warrant of your exclusive claims. His testimony, indeed, like that of many others, is not so much positive as circumstantial; but to those who are accustomed to compare the weight of evidence, there is none so convincing, because there is none so little exposed to fraud or imposition.

CHAPTER XXIV.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

To Basil, surnamed the Great, the celebrated bishop of Cesarea, we must now recur, for the next link in our chain of testimony. His works may be set down to A.D. 370, and will furnish several proofs, which seem to me conclusive, that your doctrine of papal supremacy made no part of his system.

I shall begin with citing a passage in which he mentions Peter incidentally, because I do not find any thing more to your purpose in his writings. Speaking of the general principle, that by the names of men, we do not understand their essence or their substance, but only those circumstances or qualities by which one individual stands personally distinguished from others, he says: [1] "Therefore by this word," (sc. Peter,) "we understand the son of Jonah, who was of Bethsaida, the brother of Andrew, who, from a fisherman, was called to the ministry of the

[1] In the citations from Basil, I quote your own Latin version.

Basil, Op. om. Ed. Benedict. Paris. A.D. 1721. tom. i. p. 240. "Illico enim per hanc vocem intelligimus Ionæ filium, qui fuit ex Bethsaida, Andreæ fratrem, qui ex piscatore ad apostolatus ministerium vocatus est. Qui quoniam fide præstabat, Ecclesiæ ædificationem in seipsum recepit: quorum nihil quidquam essentia est, si essentia tamquam substantia intelligatur. Qua re nomen characterem quidem Petri nobis circumscribit," &c.

apostolate: and because he preceded the rest in faith, received to himself the building of the Church. Of which things there is nothing concerning the essence of Peter, if, by essence, we understand his substance. Wherefore the name of Peter, truly, represents his character," &c.

We see here the oft-repeated fact, that Peter was the first foundation stone in the building of the Church, because he was the first to acknowledge his Redeemer. But if, by this, Basil intended to intimate your doctrine, he would have been more likely to have said, that Peter was called from being a fisherman to *the government* of the apostolate; instead of saying, that he was called to its *service* or *ministry*.

My next quotation, however, is more to the purpose. It is an extract from the liturgy which bears the name of Basil; and embraces that part where prayer is offered for the bishop of Alexandria, styling him, Most holy and blessed pontiff, father, pope, and patriarch, and calling his office the holy pontificate or high priesthood; while there is not, either here, or elsewhere through the whole of this interesting liturgy, the slightest reference to the "vicar of Christ," the "chief ruler," the pope of Rome. The passage to which I refer is as follows:

[1] "Let us again beseech the omnipotent and merciful God, the Father of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus

[1] Ibid. tom. ii. p. 675. "Oratio pro papa."

"Rursus etiam rogemus omnipotentem et misericordem Deum, Patrem Domini, Dei et Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi, per quem obsecramus et rogamus te, amator hominum, bone Domine. Memento, Domine, sanctissimi et beatissimi Pontificis nostri, Abba N. Papæ et Patriarchæ magnæ urbis Alexandriæ. Conservans, conserva eum nobis, per annos multos et tempora pacifica, perfecte fungentem eo qui illi a te commissus est pontificatu sancto, secundum sanctam et beatam tuam voluntatem, recte dispensantem verbum veritatis, pascentemque in sanctitate et jus-

Christ, through whom we pray and implore thee, O lover of men, good Lord. Remember, O Lord, our most holy and blessed pontiff, father N. pope and patriarch of the great city of Alexandria. Preserve him to us, through many years and peaceful times, so that he may perfectly fulfil the holy high priesthood (or pontificate) which thou hast committed to him, according to thy holy and blessed will, rightly dispensing the word of truth, and feeding thy people in holiness and righteousness: together with all orthodox bishops, presbyters, and deacons, and with the plenitude of thy holy, only, catholic and apostolic Church: benignly granting to them and to us, perpetual peace and health."

I need not tell you, brethren, that your liturgies, all over the world, contain a prayer of the above character for the *pope of Rome*; but the proof here furnished is conclusive evidence that the primitive Church knew nothing of such a custom; since at so late a day as the close of the fourth century, the pope of Rome had no distinct place in the devotions of the Church at Alexandria. If your chief pontiff was then universally regarded as you imagine, how, I beseech you, could it have been, that a liturgy providing so honorable a place for the pope of Alexandria, should have omitted all mention of that "vicar of Christ" who was, *by divine appointment*, the supreme pastor of the whole Church—the chief ruler over all?

Let me proceed, however, to another passage, where Basil laments the distracted state of the Church, and accounts for it, in terms altogether irreconcilable with

titia populum tuum: cum omnibus orthodoxis Episcopis, Presbyteris, Diaconis, cum omni plenitudine sanctæ, solius, Catholicæ et Apostolicæ tuæ Ecclesiæ: pacem et sanitatem ipsis et nobis benigne concedens, diebus omnibus."

your doctrine. The extract is long, but it will abundantly repay an attentive perusal.

[1] "By the favour and benignity of the most High God," saith our author, "through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and from the operation of the Holy Spirit, I was liberated from the false doctrines of the gentiles, and educated from the first, by Christian parents, and from a boy was taught by them the sacred Scriptures, which led me to the knowledge of the truth. But when I came to maturity, travelling abroad, and conversant, as may well be believed, in many kinds of business, I observed that in all other arts and sciences there was the utmost concord amongst those who diligently cultivated them; while, on the contrary, in the only Church of God, for which Christ died, and upon which he poured out so abundantly the Holy Spirit, I saw many differing most widely, not only among themselves, but also in the interpretation of the sacred Scriptures. And, what chiefly alarmed me, I found the very bishops of the Church fixed in such a diversity of opinion and sentiment among themselves, so

[1] Basil. Procemium de judicio Dei, § 1. tom. ii. p. 213.

"Optimi Dei benignitate ac humanitate, per gratiam Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ex Spiritus Sancti operatione, a falsa quidem Gentilium traditione ac doctrina liberatus, ab antiqua vero origine et ab initio a Christianis parentibus educatus, vel a puero didici ab ipsis literas sacras, quæ me ad veritatis cognitionem adduxerunt. Ubi vero ad virilem ætatem perveni, tunc sæpius peregrinatus, et in pluribus, ut credi par est, negotiis versatus, in cæteris quidem artibus et scientiis maximam inter eos qui illarum quasque diligenter excolebant, concordiam animadverti: contra vero, in sola Dei Ecclesia, pro qua Christus mortuus est, et super quam large Spiritum Sanctum effudit, multos vidi et inter se, et in divinis literis intelligendis valde admodum dissentire. Et quod maxime horrendum est, reperi ipsos Ecclesiæ præfectos in tanta inter se sententiæ ac opinionis diversitate constitui, sicque Domini nostri Jesu Christi mandatis adversari, Deique Ecclesiam tam immisericorditer dilacerare, tamque crudeliter obturbare ejus gregem, ut exortis Anomœis, nunc, si unquam alias, in ipsis quoque impleatur illud: *Ex vobis ipsis exsurgent viri loquentes perversa, ut abducant discipulos post se.*"

hostile to the precepts of our Lord Jesus Christ, lacerating with so little pity the Church of God, and so cruelly troubling his flock, that now, if ever, the Anomœans [1] seemed to have arisen, in whom that prophecy was fulfilled: *And also of yourselves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, that they might draw away disciples after them.*"

"When I beheld these and other things of the like description," continues Basil, "and was perplexed to discover the cause of so much evil, I lived some time as if in profound darkness, and in a balance; now inclining on one side, and then upon the other, at one time drawn away by regard for the long established customs of men, and again influenced by the truth which I had learned from the Holy Scriptures. But after I had remained for a long while in this condition, and had looked diligently into the cause of which I have spoken, the book of Judges came into my mind, which relates how

§ 2. "Hæc atque ejusdem generis alia cum intuerer, prætereaque cum dubitarem quæ et unde esset tanti mali causa; primum quidem quasi in profundis tenebris degebam, et tanquam in statera constitutus, modo huc modo illuc propendebam, quod alius alio aut ad seipsum me traheret, ob diutinam hominum consuetudinem, aut rursus alio propelleret, ob eam quam in divinis Scripturis agnovissem veritatem. Cum autem in eo statu diu permansissem, et eam quam dixi causam diligenter perscrutarer, mihi in mentem venit libri Judicum, qui narrat unumquemque fecisse quod in oculis suis rectum erat, atque etiam causam ejus rei declarat, his verbis: *In diebus illis non erat rex in Israel.* Horum igitur cum mihi in mentem venisset, illud quoque de præsenti rerum statu excogitavi: quod forte dictu quidem horrendum est et mirabile, sed tamen, si intelligatur, verissimum est. Num videlicet inter alumnos Ecclesiæ tanta hæc discordia ac pugna hodieque exoriatur ob unius magni verique et solius universorum regis ac Dei contemptum, cum quisque deserat Domini nostri Jesu Christi doctrinam, et quasdam ratiocinationes ac regulas peculiares suapte auctoritate sibi arroget, malitque adversus Dominum imperare quam a Domino regi?"

[1] The original Greek is very expressive, signifying those who were *unlike each other;* instead of being, according to the rule of the Gospel, "*of the same mind.*"

every man did that which was right in his own eyes, and likewise declares the cause of this thing in these words: *In those days there was no king in Israel.* When I recollected this, I thought the same might be applied to the present state of things: which is verily fearful and wonderful to tell, and yet, if it be rightly understood, is most true. For does not the discord and contention which exist at this day throughout the Church, arise from their contempt of that One great, true, and only King and God of the universe, while every one deserts the doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ, and undertakes to establish arguments and rules by his own authority, and chooses rather to govern against the Lord, than to be ruled by the Lord?"

In this extract, brethren, it seems impossible to avoid seeing that there was no consolidated empire over the whole Church conceded to any particular bishop, during the days of Basil. He deplores the divisions, the distractions, the contentions, in which the bishops themselves were engaged. But he makes no allusion to the authority of the vicar of Christ, before whose infallible tribunal every dispute and controversy should have been hushed into silence and peace. He attributes the wretched state of the Church to the same cause which the book of Judges assigns for the condition of Israel: Every man did that which was right in his own eyes, because there was no king, no supreme governor, no chief ruler. But he is so far from referring to the supremacy of any earthly vicegerent, that he expressly applies his observation to the King of kings; saying, that men were in strife through contempt of God, the only Sovereign, and that they preferred ruling against the Lord Jesus Christ, rather than being governed by him. What can more plainly prove the non-existence of your present doctrine at that day? Is it not precisely in times of anarchy and

confusion, that the lovers of order insist most upon the rights of governors? And if the catholic Church had then acknowledged an universal pope, who *held the place of the true God upon the earth*, as your canon law asserts, and to whom, in the words of your Doway commentary, Christ had given *the plenitude of power*, how should the great Basil, himself an archbishop, have complained of the contentions which distracted the Church, without one word of reference to the only regular and authoritative tribunal by which they could have been appeased?

The same topic occurs with melancholy frequency in many other parts of the works of our author; but it may be more satisfactory if I turn to some passages, which apply to a different point in the question before us.

You know that Basil flourished after the division of the Roman empire, that the eastern emperor Valens favoured Arianism, and that Basil's orthodoxy exposed him to no small measure of persecution. The state of the Church was of necessity exceedingly troubled, and moved him to continual lamentations and regrets. Amongst the means which he thought likely to be of service, we find him writing to Athanasius, the celebrated bishop of Alexandria, whose testimony we have already examined, in order to engage him to interest the bishops of the western empire, on behalf of their eastern brethren. From this epistle I shall extract some paragraphs worthy of your serious attention.

[1] "I have of late," saith Basil, addressing Athanasius, "bethought me, according to my moderate knowledge of things, of one way by which our Churches might be aided,

[1] Basil. Ep. Athanasio Episcopo Alexandriæ, Op. om. tom. iii. p. 159. 'Dudum novi et ipse pro mediocri mea rerum notitia, unam esse ecclesiis nostris auxilii viam, si nobiscum conspirent Occidentales episcopi. Nam si voluerint, quod adhibuerunt studium in uno aut altero perverse in Occidente sentire deprehensis, illud etiam pro nostrarum partium parœcia ostendere; fortasse rebus communibus nonnihil accesserit utili-

if the western bishops would consent with us. For if they were willing to shew for the sake of our diocese, the care which they have used towards those who have been detected in one heresy or another, in the west; perhaps it might yield some benefit to the common welfare: since the emperor reverences the authority of numbers, and the people every where are disposed to follow the majority without hesitation. But who is more influential in executing such a design than thee? Who is more acute in the discovery of what is expedient? Who more efficient in performing what is profitable? Who more prone to grieve for the afflictions of his brethren? What is more highly venerated than thy hoary head, by the whole western Church? Leave then some memorial of thy mode of life to mortals, O most honoured father. Adorn thine innumerable labours in the cause of piety, by this one deed: send some men from thy Church, who are powerful in sound doctrine, to the western bishops: explain to them the calamities with which we are oppressed: suggest the method of relief: thou mayest become a Samuel to the Churches: be afflicted together with those who are involved in war: offer thy prayers for peace: ask favour from the Lord, that he may graciously appoint to us some memorial of peace."

tatis, Imperatore multitudinis auctoritatem reverente et populis ubique ipsos sine dubio sequentibus. Quis autem ad hæc perficienda potentior est prudentia tua? Quis ad videndum quid deceat acutior? quis ad perficienda quæ prosunt efficacior? Quis ad dolendum ex fratrum afflictione propensior? Quis perquam reverenda canitie tua Occidenti toti venerabilior? Relinque aliquod monumentum mortalibus, tua vivendi ratione dignum, pater in primis venerande. Innumeros illos pro pietate exantlatos labores hoc uno facto exorna: mitte aliquos ex sancta tua ecclesia viros in sana doctrina potentes ad Occidentales episcopos: expone illis calamitates quibus premimur: suggere modum opis ferendæ: fias Samuel ecclesiis: affligere una cum populis bello pugnatis: offer pacificas preces: pete gratiam a Domino, ut aliquod pacis monumentum ecclesiis immittat," &c.

In this passage, brethren, you clearly see how distinct were the Churches of the eastern empire from those of the west, in the days of Basil. There is not, here, the least allusion to the authority of one common ruler at Rome, but a strong appeal to Athanasius, at Alexandria, to excite a movement among the bishops of the west in general, which might favourably influence the eastern emperor and the people at large. It was to be a voluntary effort throughout. It depended for its execution on the disposition of Athanasius, on the disposition of the west, and, finally, on the disposition of the emperor and the eastern Christians. But if, as you suppose, the whole Church throughout the world was placed from the beginning, by *divine authority*, under the government of Peter and of the Roman bishop, what had Basil to do with beseeching Athanasius to excite the compassion of the western bishops in his behalf? In such a case, he would have had a *legal right* to the protection of Rome, and could not have anticipated the want of willingness on the part of the western bishops to take the same care of heresy in the east that they had done in the west among themselves. So that we have here the plainest evidence that there was no such thing as Roman supremacy over the catholic Church, in the mind of Basil; that the dominion of one Church, as the mother and mistress Church of the whole Christian world, was perfectly unknown to him; and that the patriarchs of the east and the west could not affect each other by any ecclesiastical rule of subordination, but only by that influence which sympathy produces amongst bodies mutually independent and free.

There are several other epistles on the same subject, addressed to the bishops of Italy and Gaul, and one addressed to Damasus, then bishop of Rome; in all of which there is the same evidence of principle and polity,

and the same absence of ecclesiastical rule and domination. The appeal in every instance is made to charity, to Christian love, and to Christian influence; and in none of them do I find a sentence which seems to recognise your present doctrine.

The other passage which I designed to cite from this epistle, will show you how Basil was accustomed to speak of other Churches. Recommending in the first place, as demanding the earliest attention of Athanasius, the condition of the Church at Antioch, he says: [1] "For what do the Churches of the whole world contain, preferable to that of Antioch? Wherefore, if that Church is brought back to peace, nothing can hinder, but that *the head* being strengthened, will supply health to the whole body." Did Basil know any thing of Roman supremacy, or believe that the Church of Rome was the mother and mistress of the whole Christian world, when he wrote this passage? And again, in another of his epistles, he calls the Church of Nicopolis "*the mother Church*[2]," clearly showing the equality of the great dioceses of the Christian world in that day, and that the confining these phrases to the Church of Rome, and the dominion claimed for her over the *whole* Church, were no parts of Basil's system.

But it may be well to cite the opinion of Basil on an incidental question of Roman authority. The passage occurs in his epistle to Amphilochius concerning the

[1] Ibid. "Quid autem habeant orbis terrarum ecclesiæ, quod præferendum sit Antiochiæ? Quam si contingeret ad concordiam redire, nihil impediret, quominus velut caput corroboratum universo corpori sanitatem suppeditet.

[2] Ibid. Ep. Clericis Coloniensibus, p. 350. "Cavete litigetis cum vestra matre Ecclesia Nicopolitana:" and in the next epistle, "*Ad Coloniæ magistratus,*" he calls that Church "teneram matrem," &c.

canons; and it will probably aid you in discerning the independence of the Churches in his day. It is as follows:

[1] "The Encratites, the Saccophori, and the Apotactitæ," saith our author, "are not subject to the same rule as the Novatians, because a canon has been declared concerning them; but what concerns the others has been past by in silence. Nevertheless we re-baptize such according to the one manner. But if re-baptization is prohibited with you, *as it is among the Romans*, yet for the sake of a certain order, let our mode prevail." I do not see, brethren, how this passage can be brought to accord with your favourite doctrine; for, manifestly, if Rome was held by Basil to be the mother and mistress of all the Churches, and if every ecclesiastical question, according to your canon law, was then to be decided at the tribunal of her bishop, a prohibition of re-baptization amongst the Romans could not be made consistent with an allowance of it amongst the Greeks.

Let us next inquire into Basil's mode of speaking of general councils. And this we are able to ascertain with reasonable certainty, from a passage in which he mentions the great council of Nice, but not in terms which seem at all consistent with your doctrine.

[2] "We are the heirs of those fathers," saith he, "who formerly promulgated at Nice that great proclamation of piety; of which the other parts, truly, are above the

[1] Ibid. p. 296. "Encratitæ, et Apotactitæ non subjiciuntur eidem rationi, cui et Novatiani, quia de illis editus Canon, etsi varius; quæ autem ad istos pertinent, silentio sunt prætermissa. Nos autem una ratione tales rebaptizamus. Quod si apud vos prohibita est rebaptizatio, sicut et apud Romanos, œconomiæ alicujus gratia, nostra tamen ratio vim obtineat."

[2] Ibid. p. 145. "Siquidem et eorumdem patrum hæredes sumus, qui quondam Nicææ magnum pietatis præconium promulgarunt: cujus reliquæ quidem partes calumniæ nulli obnoxiæ sunt: sed vocem consub-

reach of calumny; but the word *consubstantial* being badly understood by some, there are those who do not yet receive it; whom one might indeed censure justly, and might nevertheless judge them worthy of pardon. For not to walk in the footsteps of the fathers, nor to submit our opinion to their stronger voice, is a thing worthy of reprehension, as being full of arrogance. While, on the other hand, to hold in suspicion a word which has been condemned by others, seems in a certain aspect of the subject, to be somewhat excusable."

Does this language correspond, brethren, with your present system, which arrogates the dignity of Holy Scripture to the decrees of this and the other general councils of the Church, on the ground that those decrees are, equally with Scripture, the dictates of the Holy Ghost, and consequently infallible? Did Basil think that the Nicene creed was inspired, when he claimed pardon for those who condemned the most important word in the whole formulary? Did he hold it to be the work of the Holy Ghost, when he censured those who liked it not, as being "full of arrogance, *because they walked not in the steps of the fathers?*" Only imagine, brethren, one of yourselves writing in favour of the council of Nice, in terms so moderate as these, and say, whether the appellation of heretic would not be the immediate fruit of his presumption?

It is to be remembered, however, in justice to your doctrine, that there is another passage in which Basil approaches your ideas much more closely. It is in his

stantialis male a nonnullis acceptam, sunt qui nondum receperint: quos quis et jure [δικαίως] reprehenderit, ac rursus venia dignos judicarit. Nam Patrum vestigiis non insistere, nec sua sententia vocem illorum potiorem ducere, res est reprehensione digna, ut plena arrogantiæ. Rursus autem vituperatam ab aliis vocem, suspectam habere videtur id quodam modo mediocrem illis excusationis veniam conciliare."

epistle to Cyriacus; where he exhorts that the brethren at Tarsus should profess the faith, [1] "as set forth," saith he, "by our fathers, who formerly came together at Nice. Neither do ye reject any word in it, but know that those three hundred and eighteen fathers who agreed without contention, spake not without the operation of the Holy Spirit; and you may add also to this faith, that it is not fit to call the Holy Spirit a creature, nor to hold communion with those who do so," &c.

You would of course infer from these words, that Basil claimed the infallibility of inspiration for the council of Nice. And yet, in truth, his phraseology imports no such thing. For, I beseech you, cannot you say as much for every minister of Christ, yea, for every private Christian, that he sets forth his faith "not without the operation of the Holy Ghost;" or, if you please, in still stronger words, that he does it "by the operation of the Holy Ghost?" If this be doubtful, ask St. Paul what he means by declaring (1 Cor. xii. 3), "*No man can say, The Lord Jesus, but by the Holy Ghost.*" Surely, then, it is most manifest, that the language of Basil, fairly interpreted, amounts to nothing more than that which we all admit: namely, that the creed of the Nicene council was an exposition of the true faith, agreeable to Scripture; and that as the operation and influence of the Spirit is present with every man who confesses the true faith; so we doubt not that his special influence was granted abundantly to that venerable assembly of the holy

[1] Ibid. p. 207. "Ut fidem a patribus nostris, qui Nicææ quondam convenerunt, editam profiteamini, nullamque in ea vocem rejiciatis, sed sciatis trecentos decem et octo patres, qui citra contentionem convenerunt, non sine Spiritus Sancti *afflatu*, [Greek, ἐνέργεια, signifying *action, operation*, which your translator has turned into a word bearing the sense of *inspiration*,] "locutos esse, atque illud etiam huic fidei addatis, Spiritum Sanctum creaturam dici non oportere, nec cum iis qui dicunt, communicandum," &c.

men of old. Yet this does not raise their words to the dignity of Scripture. And if Basil had supposed otherwise, I think he would hardly have suggested an *addition* to the creed, on the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit, as we see he did in the passage before us, as well as in other parts of his works. For if no Christian man was ever yet known to propose an addition to the inspired volume, so I cannot believe that Basil would have been so presumptuous as to propose an amendment to the Nicene creed, had he really imagined it to be the dictate of the Holy Spirit, and therefore equal in dignity to the Word of God.

On the whole, therefore, brethren, the testimony of Basil admits of no construction that is not, according to my small judgment, in direct conflict with your claims. And hence, I conceive myself entitled to rank him amongst the witnesses which prove your departure from the primitive system.

CHAPTER XXV.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

AMONGST the interesting circumstances in the life of Basil the Great, you are aware that his strong attachment to Gregory Nazianzen is conspicuous. We apply, therefore, to this cotemporary and friend of our last witness, to furnish our next testimony on the doctrine of Roman supremacy.

And first, let us hear him on the subject of the apostles. [1] "Dost thou desire," saith he, after discoursing largely on the Aaronic priesthood, "that I should also set forth another example of order and discipline, and one truly excellent and admirable, and worthy of the highest commemoration and regard at the present day? Thou seest that among the disciples of Christ, who were all, indeed, great and eminent, and deserving such election, this one is called a rock, and receives in faith the

[1] I quote your own Latin version, as before, only inserting the Greek where emendation may seem necessary.

Gregor. Nazian. Orat. 26. Ed. Paris. A. D. 1609. p. 453, 4.

"Vis aliud quoque ordinis et disciplinæ exemplum in medium proferam, idque præclarum et laudabile, ac præsenti commemoratione atque admonitione in primis dignum? Vides quemadmodum ex Christi discipulis, magnis utique omnibus et excelsis, atque electione dignis, hic petra vocetur, atque Ecclesiæ fundamenta in fidem suam recipiat. [Gr. τοῖς θεμηλίοις τῆς ἐκκλησίας πιστεύεται, i. e. *believes in the foundations of the Church*, which your translator renders; *receives in faith the foundations of*

foundations of the Church; another is loved more exceedingly, and reclines upon the breast of Jesus, and the other disciples endure the preference bestowed upon these with an equal mind. Again, when Christ was about to ascend into the mount, that he might show his glory in corporeal form, and manifest his divinity, and unclothe himself of the fleshy covering, who ascended the mount with him? (for all were not admitted to behold this miracle) Peter, John, and James, who were before the others, and were reckoned so. Again, when depressed in mind, and withdrawing himself a little before his passion, commending those who were present to labour in prayer, who were taken with him? The same three. And this was the preference and choice of Christ. But how great was the modesty and order of the rest? Peter asks one thing, Philip another, Judas another, Thomas another, and any one else another; neither do all ask the same, nor does one ask every thing; but each by turns, and severally. You will here say, perhaps, that each

the Church. I have taken his version, however: although the original does not warrant it: because in the result the difference is but a trifle.] "Ille impensius ametur, et supra pectus Jesu requiescat, ac reliqui discipuli eos sibi præferri æquo ferant. Jam cum in montem ascendendum fuisset, ut Christus corporea forma splenderet, ac divinitatem suam patefaceret, eumque, qui carne tegebatur, nudaret, atque aperiret, quinam simul ascendunt? (Nec enim omnes ad hujus miraculi spectaculum admittuntur) Petrus, Johannes, et Jacobus, qui ante alios, et erant, et numerabantur. Rursus cum animi anxio, et paulo ante passionem secedenti, ac precibus operam danti quosdam adesse oporteret, quinam ad eam rem asciti sunt? Iidem illi. Atque hæc Christi prælatio et electio fuit. Quid? reliqua moderatio ordinisque disciplina, quanta? Aliud Petrus interrogat, aliud Philippus, aliud Judas, aliud Thomas, aliud alius quispiam, neque aut idem omnes, aut omnia unus, sed vicissim quisque, ac sigillatim. Dices hic fortasse, hoc singulos quæsivisse, quod cuique opus erat. Quid? Quale illud tibi videtur? Philippus quiddam dicere gestit, nec solus audet, verum Andream quoque adhibet. Petrus aliquid percunctari cupit, et Joannem capitis nutu proponit. Ubi hic morositas? Ubi dominandi libido?"

asked what he had need of. How should it seem so? Philip desires to say somewhat, but he dares not alone, and therefore brings Andrew with him. Peter wishes to make an inquiry, and procures John to do it, by a motion of the head. Where, in all this, is any austerity? Where, any lust of domination?"

There is surely nothing in this interesting passage, brethren, that can be rendered consistent with the idea of Peter's single government over the other apostles. Gregory considers Peter, John, and James, as the distinguished three; even as St. Paul had said, that the same three "seemed to be pillars." Of these, he gives no authority to one over the others; but praises the general equality which reigned throughout the whole. How unlike the style in which an advocate of your present system would treat the subject, I need hardly say.

In the second place, however, let me cite our witness on the mode in which it was customary to speak of the various important sees of the Church.

In his nineteenth oration, for example, he says that the Church of Nazianzum, of which his father was bishop, and himself coadjutor, should be called, [1] "The new Jerusalem, a second ark rising above the waves, like that of the great Noah, the second parent of the world." And proceeding in the same strain, he adds that "this Church surpasses others in celebrity, as much as they surpassed it in numbers; being in this respect like Bethlehem, which, although it was a little city, was yet the

[1] Ibid. p. 297. "Ut nova Hierusalem, ac secunda quædam arca undis eminens quemadmodum illa magni illius Noë, secundique hujus mundi parentis, hæc Ecclesia [sc. Nazianzena] vocaretur,"——"Quantumque aliis numero cedebat, tanto eas nominis celebritate vinceret, idemque ipsi usu veniret, quod Bethlehem accidisse videmus, quam nulla res prohibuit, quominus simul, et parva civitas esset, et totius terræ metropolis, utpote Christi orbis conditoris ac victoris, parentem atque nutricem."

metropolis of the whole earth, by reason of its being the parent and the nurse of Christ, the Creator and Conqueror of the world." But not only in this instance does the testimony of the fathers claim for other Churches the high encomiums which your system would fain monopolize for Rome; since I find the elder Gregory using expressions still stronger in favour of the Church of Cæsarea. The passage occurs in an epistle, written to that Church for the purpose of commending Basil to their choice as their bishop; inasmuch as Gregory was prevented by sickness from visiting them in person. [1] "Moreover," saith he, "while we should regard all the Churches with the utmost care and solicitude, as being the body of Christ, yet should we chiefly thus regard your Church, which was not only the *mother of almost all the Churches from the beginning*, but is so now, and is so considered; towards which the *whole Christian commonwealth turns its eyes*, even as the circumference of a circle to its centre; not only on account of the soundness of the faith hitherto preached to all, but also on account of the grace of unity, granted to her, beyond doubt, by the divine favour." Greatly, brethren, am I mistaken with respect to the meaning of words, if this passage does not far exceed any thing which we have yet met with, in favour of the Church of Rome.

Under this head, I only add two examples of the phrase *Catholic Church*, applied by Gregory, in his last will and

[1] Greg. Naz. Epist. Ibid. p. 785. D. "Porro cum omnibus Ecclesiis, tanquam Christi corpori, summa cura et solicitudine prospiciendum sit, tum maxime vestræ, quæ omnium fere Ecclesiarum mater et antiquitus [Greek, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, *from the beginning*,] fuit, et nunc est, atque censetur, et ad quam tota Respublica Christiana oculos conjicit, haud secus ac circulus centro circumscriptus, non modo propter fidei integritatem jam olim omnibus prædicatam, sed etiam ob concordiæ gratiam, divino haud dubie beneficio ipsi concessam."

testament, to the Church at Nazianzum, and the Church at Constantinople. [1] "I Gregory, bishop of the catholic Church of Constantinople," direct "that my heir shall restore all my goods moveable and immoveable, to the holy catholic Church of Nazianzum," &c. This, in itself, is a very small matter; but I think it worth remarking, because there is no one circumstance which tends to give so great an appearance of weight to your claims, as the mode in which your writers appropriate the term *Catholic*, to the Church of Rome; thereby making the ancient fathers seem to speak of your particular Church, when, in truth, they were thinking only of the orthodox Church at large, *as opposed to heresy*. In justice to the primitive writers, it should be well understood, therefore, that when the fathers use the phrase *The holy catholic Church*, they mean *the orthodox Church throughout the world*, without relation to any particular place whatever. But when they intend the orthodox Church of a special diocese, they say *the catholic Church of that diocese*, as in the case before us. For inasmuch as heresy and schism always began amongst a small number, the fact that the general, universal, or *catholic* faith stood in opposition to them, was always urged in the beginning of innovation, as a strong argument on the side of truth; and the *catholicism* or universality of Christian doctrine became synonymous with its *orthodoxy*. This, I apprehend to be the true reason, why the Nicene creed continued to be called the catholic faith, even when Arianism triumphed. There was a time, you remember, when the saying was current: *Athanasius against the world:* so vast was the majority which seemed to favour the heresy of Arius. Yet even

[1] Append. Op. Greg. Naz. "Gregorius Episcopus Catholicæ Constantinopolis Ecclesiæ, vivens et prudens, sanoque judicio," &c.——"Ita quidem, ut ipse meam omnem substantiam, mobilem et immobilem, sanctæ Catholicæ Nazianzi Ecclesiæ restituat," &c.

then, the *catholic* fathers used the same phraseology as before, meaning, not the faith which was universal at that particular period, but the faith which had been universal in the beginning. By the very same authority, that portion of the Church which accords with the primitive system now, has the best right to be called *the Catholic Church*, even if, numerically, it were the smallest body in Christendom.

But let me hasten to the third point which our present witness testifies, viz. the torn and divided state of the Church, which so clearly demonstrates the freedom exercised by all its parts to take their own course, without regard to the common "mother and mistress," to the pope of Rome, or any other supposed "vicar of Christ," bearing the authority, "not of a mere man, but of the true God upon the earth," as your modern canon law expresses it. [1] "The great heritage of God," saith Gregory, "acquired by the doctrine and precepts and torments of Christ, the holy nation, the royal priesthood, is ill at ease, distracted amongst six hundred opinions and errors: the vine from Egypt, that is, from dark and impious ignorance, transplanted, and grown to an immense size and proportion, has covered the whole earth, and has risen above the mountains and the cedars." And again, saith he, [2] "Grievous wolves, intercepting us on every

[1] Ibid. Orat. Vicesima, p. 345. C. "Cumque magnam illam Dei hæreditatem, ipsiusque (sc. Christi) doctrina et legibus atque cruciatibus acquisitam, gentem illam sanctam, regium Sacerdotium, male se habere atque in sexcentas opiniones et errores distractum esse; vineamque illam, quæ ex Ægypto, hoc est ex impia et caliginosa ignorantia, translata et transplantata fuerat, atque ad tam immensam pulchritudinem et magnitudinem pervenerat, ut terram universam operiret, ac supra montes et cedros assurgeret," &c.

[2] Ibid. Orat. Vicesimatertia, p. 415. "Gravesque lupi, alii aliunde nos intercipientes, Ecclesiam discerpunt. Armantur sacerdotes adversus sacerdotes, plebs adversus plebem furibundo impetu fertur. Imperator

side, tear the Church to pieces. Bishops are armed against bishops, people are opposed against people with a furious excitement. The emperor himself gives authority to impiety, and enacts laws against orthodox doctrine." And again, [1] "Even as the book of the Acts relates of the Athenians," saith he, "so we spend our time in nothing else but to say or hear some new thing. Oh! what Jeremiah shall deplore our confusion and darkness! for he alone could pour forth lamentations worthy of our calamities."

Brethren, if the prerogatives of Rome and her popes had then been allowed as you represent them, how could the Church and her bishops have become thus distracted and divided? And if Gregory had held your creed in this respect, how could he have deplored such evils without insisting upon their only lawful remedy, namely, an immediate recurrence to the final sentence of the infallible judge, whom God himself had endowed with "the plenitude of power?"

One passage more, however, from the writings of this celebrated father, will show us, in the last place, what he thought on the subject of councils. It occurs in the form of a letter, written to Procopius, as follows:

[2] "I have resolved, if I may declare the truth, to avoid henceforth every convention of bishops; because I

ipse impietati authoritatem præbet, atque adversus orthodoxam doctrinam leges instituit," &c.

[1] Ibid. p. 380. "Quodque Actorum liber de Atheniensibus narrat, ad nihil aliud vacamus, quam ut novi aliquid dicamus vel audiamus. O quis Hieremias confusionem nostram caliginemque deplorabit, qui solus lamentationes calamitatibus exæquare novit!"

[2] Greg. Naz. Ep. Procopio, Op. om. p. 814. "Ego, si vera scribere oportet, hoc animo sum, ut omnem Episcoporum conventum fugiam: quoniam nullius concilii finem lætum et faustum vidi, nec quod depulsionem malorum potius, quam accessionem et incrementum habuerit. Pertinaces enim contentiones et dominandi cupiditates (ac ne me quæso gravem et molestum existimes, hæc scribentem) ne ullis quidem verbis

have never yet seen a prosperous and happy conclusion of any council; nor any that might not be said to have increased existing evils, rather than to have driven them away. For the pertinacious contentions and strifes of domination, (I pray you, do not consider me severe or uncharitable in writing thus) cannot be described in words: and any one who should offer his judgment to others, would find himself much more readily charged with his offence, than allowed to repress the offences of his associates. Wherefore I have deemed it best, that I should collect myself, and preserve the safety of my soul in solitude and peace. And truly, as I think, disease comes to my aid at this time, and so afflicts me, that I almost expect every day to breathe my last; nor do I find any remedy of use to me. On this account, therefore, I trust your magnanimity will excuse my absence; and will farther incline you to take pains, that our most pious emperor may not suppose me guilty of sloth and negligence, but may pardon my weakness:" &c.

A declaration like this, brethren, coming from such high authority, might well be regarded as a serious impediment to the triumph of your system, since it strikes at the very root of your infallibility. It is no wonder, therefore, that your writers should endeavour to evade its force. A specimen of their argument is very carefully inserted, as an admonitory prologue to the

explicari queant: citiusque aliquis improbitatem arcessetur, dum aliis judicem se præbet, quam ut aliorum improbitatem comprimat. Propterea memetipsum collegi, animæque securitatem in sola quiete ac solitudine mihi positam judicavi. Nunc vero huic quoque meo judicio patronus morbus accedit, quippe qui me ita distorqueat, ut quotidie fere extremos spiritus efflem, nec ulla re meipso uti queam. Atque ob hanc causam ignoscat mihi tua animi magnitudo; detque operam ne pientissimus imperator me inertiæ atque ignaviæ condemnet, sed infirmitati ignoscat."

epistle in question; and I present it to you entire, for your greater satisfaction.

[1] "Gregory," saith your apologist, "was called to a certain council at Constantinople. Therefore he declares that he abhors all councils of bishops, on account of the quarrels and contentions, in which they became mutually involved: and at the same time he excuses himself by reason of ill health. The authority of this epistle is abused by Calvin for the purpose of impugning councils; but no pious mind should be moved thereat. For Gregory is not speaking of general councils, but of certain particular or provincial ones. Otherwise he would contradict himself, since in many places he praises the Nicene council to the skies, and he was himself a prime actor in the council of Constantinople, which condemned and anathematized the Macedonians, who opposed the Holy Spirit."

What think you, brethren, of this ratiocination? Gregory had attended many councils; some general, some provincial. For a long course of years he had been a spectator of their influence upon the Church, with the best possible opportunities of observation; since he was first, bishop of Nazianzum, and afterwards, bishop of Constantinople, and was distinguished far more by his learning and his disinterestedness, than by his exalted station. And near the close of his life, he gives his true

[1] Ibid. Argumentum. "Constantinopolim ad concilium quoddam vocabatur Gregorius. Ait igitur se ab omnibus Episcoporum conciliis abhorrere, propter rixas et contentiones, quibus inter se conflictantur: simulque valetudinem excusat. Hujus quidem epistolæ authoritate ad conciliorum oppugnationem Calvinus abutitur, sed neminem piorum movere debet. Nec enim de generalibus, sed de particularibus quibusdam conciliis loquitur. Alioqui enim secum ipse pugnaret, utpote qui pluribus locis Nicænum concilium laudibus in cœlum ferat, et magna ipse pars fuerit Constantinopolitanæ synodi, in qua Macedoniani, qui Spiritui Sancto bellum indixerant, damnati atque anathemate percussi sunt."

sentiments, in a private letter to a friend, declaring that he had resolved to avoid *all conventions of bishops*, for he had never seen *any council* come to a prosperous conclusion, but, on the contrary, thought they had increased the evils they were meant to cure. He accounts for this immediately by adding, that the *contentions and ambitious rivalry of the bishops could not be expressed in words.* And we are gravely told, in the face of all this, that Gregory did not mean *general councils* at all, but only provisional synods! Because he praises the creed of the council of Nice, which was held before he was born, therefore he is not to be understood according to his own plain meaning when he declares, that *all* the councils which *he had seen*, were productive of more evil than good! True, indeed, it is, that he was a prime actor, with others, in general councils; not perhaps of choice, but of necessity; for these councils were summoned by the emperors, and the bishops could not absent themselves, unless they were excused. And for this very reason it is—because he had been an active member of general councils—that when he speaks thus disparagingly of *all* the councils he had ever known, without excepting any, we are sure he must have included the general councils amongst the rest. The modern distinctions then, which your canon law lays down, asserting that general councils are not liable to sin or error, while provincial councils are subject to both, were surely not known in the days of Gregory. According to his experience, both were equally open to the strifes and quarrels of the bishops; both were equally liable to witness the most shameful contests for power; and from *all councils*, therefore, without distinction or difference, he had resolved to absent himself, that he might possess his soul in peace.

CHAPTER XXVI.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

A VERY celebrated name stands next upon the list of your canonical favourites, Ambrose, the bishop of Milan, who boldly closed the doors of the Church against the emperor Theodosius himself, in the just administration of ecclesiastical discipline. From the works of this distinguished man, I proceed to cite some testimony on the point in question, which will show how far his sentiments differed from your doctrine. Like Origen and others, Ambrose considered Peter as representing the Church, not with respect to any form of ecclesiastical polity, but as regarded the spiritual results of faith in securing the kingdom of heaven. Thus he declares, truly, that the Church was built on Peter, that he received the keys of the kingdom, &c., but withal asserts, that what was said to Peter was said to all the apostles; that the foundation of the Church was not on Peter's person, but on the faith which he professed; that the apostles were equal; nay, that all Christians are as Peter, if they have the faith of Peter; so that while there are many passages in his writings, which, *taken alone, seem to favour your system*, the whole together are utterly opposed to it. But let him speak for himself, brethren, and judge accordingly.

In his elaborate discourses on the Psalms, for instance,

we read as follows: [1] "This is that Peter to whom Christ said: *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church.* Therefore, where Peter is, there is the Church: where the Church is, there is no death; but life eternal. And therefore he adds: *The gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.* That blessed Peter, against whom the gates of hell prevailed not, did not close the gates of heaven against himself; but, on the contrary, destroyed the entrances of hell, and made manifest the entrances to heaven. Being, therefore, placed on earth, he opened heaven, and closed hell." The best commentary on his meaning here, will be obtained by comparing it with the following:

[2] "It is this Peter who answers for the other apostles, yea, before the others; and therefore he is called a foundation, because he professes to keep not only that which is proper to himself, but common to all. To him Christ declares that his Father had revealed it. For he who speaks the true generation of the Father, receives it not from flesh, but from the Father. FAITH, THEREFORE, IS THE FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH: for it was not said of the flesh of Peter, but of his faith, that the

[1] S. Ambros. Op. Ed. Benedict. tom. i. p. 879. F. [in Psalm xl. Enar. § 30.] "Ipse est Petrus cui dixit: *Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam.* Ubi ergo Petrus, ibi Ecclesia, ibi nulla mors, sed vita æterna. Et ideo addidit: *Et portæ inferi non prævalebunt ei: et tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum.* Beatus Petrus, cui non inferorum porta prævaluit, non cœli portas se clausit; sed e contrario destruxit inferni vestibula, patefecit cœlestia. In terris itaque positus cœlum aperuit, inferos clausit."

[2] Ibid. tom. ii. p. 711. (De Incarn. Sacram. Cap. 4. § 33.) "Hic est ergo Petrus qui respondit pro ceteris apostolis, imo præ ceteris; et ideo fundamentum dicitur, quia novit non solum proprium, sed etiam commune servare. Huic adstipulatus est Christus, revelavit Pater. Nam qui veram generationem loquitur Patris, a Patre adsumsit, non sumsit ex carne." § 34. "Fides ergo est Ecclesiæ fundamentum: non enim de

gates of death should not prevail against it: but the confession (of faith) overcame hell. And this confession does not exclude one heresy only; for since the Church, like a good ship, is often assailed by many waves, the foundation of the Church ought to prevail against all heresies."

This, brethren, renders it perfectly manifest that Ambrose did not interpret your favourite texts of Scripture so as to draw from them any argument for Peter's supremacy. But our witness goes much farther in the following passages, to which I beg your serious attention. Addressing himself to Christians in general, he saith: [1] "Believe therefore as Peter believed, that you also may be blessed, that you may deserve to hear: *Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven.* For WHOEVER overcomes the flesh, IS A FOUNDATION OF THE CHURCH: if he cannot equal Peter, he can imitate him: for the gifts of God are great, who has not only repaired in us what is ours, but has even vouchsafed to grant us what is his own." And again: [2] "The rock," saith Ambrose, "is Christ: *For they drank of that spiritual rock which followed them, and that rock was Christ:* and he has not denied to his disciple even the favour of this word, *that he may also be a Peter*, because

carne Petri, sed de fide dictum est quia portæ mortis ei non prævalebunt: sed confessio vicit infernum. Et hæc confessio non unam hæresim exclusit; nam cum Ecclesia multis tamquam bona navis fluctibus sæpe tundatur, adversus omnes hæreses debet valere Ecclesiæ fundamentum."

[1] Ibid. tom. i. p. 1406. [Expositio Evang. sec. Luc. lib. vi. § 94.] "Crede igitur sic quemadmodum Petrus credidit, ut et tu beatus sis, ut et tu audire merearis: *Quoniam non caro et sanguis tibi revelavit, sed Pater meus qui in cœlis est.*"

Ibid. § 95. "Qui enim carnem vicerit, Ecclesiæ fundamentum est: si æquare Petrum non potest, imitari potest: magna sunt enim Dei munera, qui non solum nobis quæ nostra fuerant reparavit, verumetiam quæ sunt sua propria concessit."

[2] Ibid. § 97. p. 1407. "Petra est Christus: *Bibebant enim de Spirituali sequente petra, petra autem erat Christus:* etiam discipulo suo hujus

from the rock he derives the solidity of perseverance, and the firmness of faith. Strive, therefore, that thou also mayest be a rock. And look for that rock, not without thee, but within. The rock is thine action, the rock is thy mind. Upon that rock thy house is built; that it may be struck by no spiritual wickedness. The rock is thy faith, faith is the foundation of the Church. If thou art a rock, thou shalt be in the Church; because the Church is upon the rock. If thou art in the Church, the gates of hell shall not prevail against thee. The gates of hell are the gates of death; but the gates of death can never be the gates of the Church."

Doubtless, brethren, you recognise in these passages the ideas of Origen. And I cannot deny myself the satisfaction of adding somewhat more, that you may see the correspondence to be complete. [1] "But what," continues our author, "are the gates of death, that is, the gates of hell, unless they be the several sins? If thou art a fornicator, thou hast entered the gates of death. If thou hast violated thy faith, thou hast gone through the gates of hell. If thou hast committed any mortal sin, thou hast passed the gates of death: but God is mighty, who exalteth thee from the gates of death; that

vocabuli gratiam non negavit, ut ei ipse sit Petrus, quod de petra habeat soliditatem constantiæ, fidei firmitatem.

Ibid. § 98. "Enitere ergo ut et tu petra sis. Itaque non extra te, sed intra te petram require. Petra tua actus est, petra tua mens est. Supra hanc petram ædificatur domus tua; ut nullis possit nequitiæ spiritualis reverberari procellis. Petra tua fides est, fundamentum Ecclesiæ fides est. Si petra fueris, in Ecclesia eris: quia Ecclesia supra petram est. Si in Ecclesia fueris, portæ inferi non prævalebunt tibi. Portæ inferi, portæ mortis sunt: portæ autem mortis, portæ Ecclesiæ esse non possunt."

[1] Ibid. § 99. "Quæ autem sunt portæ mortis, hoc est, portæ inferi, nisi singula quæque peccata? Si fornicatus fueris, portas mortis ingressus es. Si fidem læseris, portas inferi penetrasti. Si peccatum mortale commiseris, portas mortis intrasti: sed potens est Deus, qui exaltet te

thou mayest announce all his praises in the gates of the daughter of Sion. And the gates of the Church are the gates of chastity, the gates of righteousness, into which the just enter," &c. In all this, it is undeniable that Ambrose sustains most fully the authority of Origen, upon the points in question.

Another interesting passage occurs elsewhere, which may aid in showing you the true sentiments of this eminent father. Speaking of David's seeming violation of the ceremonial law, on the occasion mentioned by our Redeemer, Ambrose saith: [1] "But how should this observer and defender of the law eat, and also give to those who were with him, that bread which it was not lawful for any to eat except for the priests alone; unless he designed to show by this figure, that the food of the priests was to be extended likewise to the people? Whether because we ought all to imitate the sacerdotal life, or because all the sons of the Church are priests, for we are anointed to be a holy priesthood, offering ourselves as spiritual sacrifices unto God."

But let us next look at a few examples of the mode in which our witness speaks of Peter, in connexion with the other apostles; where, if I mistake not, their equality in office and in privilege will be clearly shown.

Thus, arguing against the error of the Novatians, he

de portis mortis; ut annunties omnes laudes ejus in portis filiæ Sion. Portæ autem Ecclesiæ portæ castitatis sunt, portæ justitiæ, quas justus intrare consuevit," &c.

[1] Ibid. (p. 1364.) lib. v. § 33. "Quomodo autem ille observator legis atque defensor, panes et ipse manducavit, et dedit iis qui secum erant, quos non licebat manducare nisi tantummodo sacerdotibus; nisi ut per illam demonstraret figuram, sacerdotalem cibum ad usum transiturum esse populorum? Sive quod omnes vitam sacerdotalem debemus imitari: sive quia omnes filii Ecclesiæ sacerdotes sunt, ungimur enim in sacerdotium, offerentes nosmet ipsos Deo hostias spiritales."

saith: [1] "To thee, saith our Lord, I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that thou mayest loose and bind. Novatian did not hear this, but the Church of God heard it. *What is said to Peter, is said to the apostles.*"

Again: [2] "For as Peter, James, and John, and Barnabas, seemed to be pillars of the Church, so also *whosoever shall overcome the world, becomes a pillar of God.*"

Again: [3] "Therefore," saith Ambrose, "three are chosen who should ascend the mount—Peter went up, who received the keys of the kingdom; John also, to whom is committed the mother of our Lord; and likewise James, who *first ascended the episcopal chair.*"

Again: [4] "Go," saith he, "to my brethren, that is, to those eternal gates, which were lifted up when they had seen Jesus. One eternal gate is Peter, against whom the gates of hell shall not prevail. John and James are eternal gates, inasmuch as they are the sons of thunder. The Churches are eternal gates, where the prophet, desiring to announce the praise of Christ, saith,

[1] Ib. in Psal. 38. Enarr. (tom. i. p. 858.) § 37. "Tibi, inquit, dabo claves regni cœlorum, ut et solvas et liges. Hoc Novatianus non audivit, sed Ecclesia Dei audivit ——. Quod Petro dicitur, apostolis dicitur."

[2] Ib. in Psal. 118. Expositio, (p. 1030.) § 38. "Nam sicut Petrus, Jacobus, et Johannes, et Barnabas columnæ esse videbantur Ecclesiæ; et quicumque vicerit hoc sæculum, fit columna Dei," &c.

[3] Ib. Expositio Evang. sec. Luc. lib. vii. § 9. p. 1413. "Tres igitur eliguntur, qui adscenderent montem ——. Petrus adscendit, qui claves regni cœlorum accepit: Johannes quoque, cui committitur Domini mater: Jacobus etiam, qui primus solium sacerdotale conscendit."

[4] Ib. tom. ii. p. 525. De fide, lib. iv. cap. 2. § 25. "Vade ergo ad fratres meos, hoc est, ad illas portas æternales, quæ cum Jesum viderint, elevabantur. Æternalis porta est Petrus, cui portæ inferi non prævalebunt. Æternales portæ Johannes et Jacobus, utpote filii tonitrui. Æternales portæ sunt Ecclesiæ, ubi laudes Christi annuntiare propheta desiderans dicit: *Ut annuntiem omnes laudationes tuas in portis filiæ Sion.*"

that I may announce all thy praise in the gates of the daughter of Sion."

In his treatise concerning the Holy Spirit, there are a few other passages, which ought perhaps to be presented, before we close this part of our witness's testimony. They are as follows:

[1] "Nor is this operation of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost found only in Peter, but the same unity of the divine work is revealed *in all the apostles*, as the authority of the heavenly Constitution."

[2] "Therefore we behold unity of government, unity of system, unity of bounty."

[3] "This is the heritage of apostolic faith and devotion, which may be gathered from the consideration of the acts of the apostles themselves. Therefore Paul and Barnabas obeyed the commands of the Holy Spirit. And all the postles obeyed the same."

[4] "Nor was Paul inferior to Peter, although the one was the foundation of the Church, and the other a wise architect, knowing how to establish the steps of those who believed: nor was Paul, I say, unworthy of the apostolic college, since he may also be compared with the first, and was *second to none.* For he who does not acknowledge himself inferior, makes himself equal."

[1] Ibid. p. 662. De Spiritu Sancto, lib. 11. cap. 13. § 148. "Nec solum una operatio in Petro Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti invenitur, sed etiam in omnibus apostolis divinæ operationis unitas revelatur, et quædam supernæ constitutionis auctoritas."

[2] Ibid. p. 663. § 153. "Unitas igitur imperii, unitas constitutionis, unitas largitatis."

[3] Ibid. p. 664. § 155. "Hæc est apostolicæ fidei et devotionis hereditas, quam licet et ex ipsorum apostolorum considerare actibus. Paruerunt ergo Paulus et Barnabas Sancti Spiritus imperatis. Paruerunt et omnes apostoli," &c.

[4] Ibid. § 158. "Nec Paulus inferior Petro, quamvis ille Ecclesiæ fundamentum, et hic sapiens architectus sciens vestigia credentium fundare populorum: nec Paulus, inquam, indignus apostolorum collegio,

I trust, brethren, that I have furnished a sufficient number of extracts, to satisfy you with regard to the sentiments of this celebrated father upon the point before us. And yet there is abundant proof remaining unnoticed, of which my limits compel me to extract much less than I would otherwise rejoice to set before you. Our next quotation, however, I regard as peculiarly valuable, beeause it gives us not only a direct proof of the independence which Ambrose exercised with regard to the Church of Rome, but some other intimations deserving our best attention.

In a discourse upon the sacred ceremony of washing of feet, which was used in primitive days by many of the Churches, and was greatly esteemed by Ambrose, he saith: [1] "We are not ignorant that the Church of Rome has not this custom, the example and form of which Church we follow in all things: this custom, nevertheless, of washing of feet, she does not retain. Behold, therefore, *perhaps she has declined on account of the multitude.* There are some, truly, who endeavour to excuse her by the plea, that this custom is not a sacred rite: it is not to be done in baptism, nor in regeneration, but it is simply to be done to our guests, as a mark of hospitality. But it is one thing to perform an act in token of humility, and another thing to perform it in order to sanctification. Hear, therefore, how we prove

cum primo quoque facile conferendus, et nulli secundus. Nam qui se imparem nescit, facit æqualem."

[1] S. Ambrosii De Sacramentis, lib. iii. cap. 1. § 5. tom. 2. p. 362, 3. "Non ignoramus quod Ecclesia Romana hanc consuetudinem non habeat, cujus typum in omnibus sequimur et formam: hanc tamen consuetudinem non habet, ut pedes lavet. Vide ergo, forte propter multitudinem declinavit. Sunt tamen qui dicant et excusare conentur quia hoc non in mysterio faciendum est, non in baptismate, non in regeneratione: sed quasi hospiti pedes lavandi sint. Aliud est humilitatis, aliud sanctificationis. Denique audi quia mysterium est et sanctificatio: *Nisi lavero*

this to be a sacred rite, in order to sanctification: *Unless I wash thy feet, (saith Christ) thou hast no part in me.* I do not speak thus, however, that I may censure others, but that I may commend my office. I desire in all things to follow the Church of Rome: but, nevertheless, we men have sense also; and therefore *whatever is more correctly practised elsewhere, we are more correct in practising.*"

[1] "In this respect," continues Ambrose, "we follow the apostle Peter himself, we adhere to the example of his devotion. What can the Church of Rome say to this? For truly Peter the apostle, who was bishop of the Church of Rome, is our authority for this assertion. Peter himself saith: *Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head.* Behold his faith."

Now, here, brethren, we see distinctly the growth of your doctrine. The earlier writers do not set down Peter as bishop of Rome. You remember the testimony of Irenæus, whose catalogue was adopted by Eusebius, the ecclesiastical historian. But Cyprian, although a little earlier than Eusebius, favours the statement, being one of the Latin fathers, and much more liable to the influence of the Roman see. Carthage was in this respect very differently situated from Cesarea. For a similar reason, Ambrose was likely to have felt the full power of Roman superiority. He was the bishop, as you know, of Milan—an Italian bishop—whose locality alone must

tibi pedes, non habebis mecum partem. Hoc ideo dico, non quod alios reprehendam, sed mea officia ipse commendem. In omnibus cupio sequi Ecclesiam Romanam: sed tamen et nos homines sensum habemus; ideo quod alibi rectius servatur, et nos rectius custodimus."

[1] § 6. "Ipsum sequimur apostolum Petrum, ipsius inhæremus devotioni. Ad hoc Ecclesia Romana quid respondet? Utique ipse auctor est nobis hujus adsertionis Petrus apostolus, qui sacerdos fuit Ecclesiæ Romanæ. Ipse Petrus ait: *Domine, non solum pedes, sed etiam manus et caput.* Vide fidem."

have secured the highest measure of acquiescence in the opinions and claims of the mistress city. No wonder, therefore, that he desires in all things to follow the example and form of the Church of Rome. No wonder that he admits her claim to the episcopate of the apostle Peter. And yet, notwithstanding the attachment and devotion of Ambrose to the Church of Rome—mark it, brethren, I beseech you—he presumes to differ from her, to retain and practise a sacred ceremony which she had cast away, to argue against her openly in a public discourse, to charge her with declining after the multitude, and to prefer his own judgment and the custom of other Churches, on a point of sacred order, which he regarded as a means of sanctification; opposing to the opinion of Rome, the *Scripture*, and significantly asking: "*What can the Church of Rome say to this?*"

Truly, we who aim to be CATHOLICS of the primitive stamp, ask no better rule than this example of your own sainted Ambrose. Honestly might we say, with him, "We desire to follow the Church of Rome in all things;" provided we might be allowed, with him, to honour the authority of Scripture above the practice of Rome, and to guard our Christian liberty by the noble declaration: "Nevertheless we men have sense also; and, therefore, whatever is more correct than the doctrine of Rome, we are more correct in retaining."

There is yet, however, one document more, furnished by your authors under the authority of Ambrose, which I have examined with considerable interest. It is the record of the acts of the council of Aquileia, held by the order of the emperors for the purpose of suppressing the Arian heresy, under Ambrose himself, who appears, throughout, as the presiding bishop, although his name stands second on the list of subscriptions, under that of the bishop of Aquileia. This was a western council, bre-

thren, held in a city of Italy, before which were summoned several bishops accused of heresy. Two only appear to have attended, viz. Palladius and Secundianus, who were condemned unanimously. I cite the following passages from the record to prove that even a particular council was held in Italy itself, which the pope did not summon, over which he did not preside, and for a purpose which your canon law now refers solely to his tribunal, BY DIVINE RIGHT.

At the opening of the council, [1] "Ambrose the bishop said: Our discussions upon this matter are to be confirmed by the imperial warrant, that they may be alleged with authority."

Accordingly, "The imperial warrant is recited in the council." After which, "Ambrose the bishop said: Behold what our Christian emperor has determined. He desires not to injure the priesthood, and therefore he has constituted the bishops interpreters." Not one word occurs in the whole, recognizing or alluding to the pope of Rome.

The Arians being then called upon to answer, Palladius refused, saying: [2] "By your management it is contrived that this should not be a full and general council: our colleagues, therefore, being absent, we cannot answer.

[1] Ibid. tom. ii. p. 787. "Ambrosius episcopus dixit: Disceptationes nostræ ex re firmandæ sunt scripto imperiali, ut allegentur."

"Scriptum imperiale recitatur in Concilio," &c.

"Ambrosius episcopus dixit: Ecce quod Christianus constituit imperator. Noluit injuriam facere sacerdotibus, ipsos interpretes constituit episcopos."

[2] Ibid. p. 788. § 6. "Palladius dixit: Vestro studio factum est, ut non esset generale et plenum Concilium: absentibus consortibus nostris, nos respondere non possumus.

"Ambrosius episcopus dixit: Qui sunt consortes vestri?

"Palladius dixit: Orientales episcopi.

§ 7. "Ambrosius

"Ambrose the bishop said: Who are your colleagues?

"Palladius replied: The eastern bishops.

"Ambrose the bishop said: Since it has been the usage of latter times, that the eastern bishops, being resident in the region of the east, should hold councils there, and the western bishops in the west; we, being settled in the western parts, have assembled at the city of Aquileia, according to the command of the emperor. However, the prefect of Italy has given orders, that if the eastern bishops chose to meet with us, they might do so: but as they know the custom that the eastern councils should be held in the east, and the western in the west, therefore they have not thought fit to come."

The synodical epistle, addressed by the fathers of this council to the emperors, commences in the following strain.

[1] "To the most clement, most Christian, and most blessed emperors and princes Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius, the holy council which is assembled at Aquileia," (sendeth greeting:)

"Blessed be God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has given you the Roman empire; and blessed be our Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, who preserves your kingdom in his piety, in whom we give thanks to you, most clement princes, because you

§ 7. "Ambrosius episcopus dixit: Interim quia superioribus temporibus concilium sic factum est, ut orientales in orientis partibus constituti haberent concilium, occidentales in occidente; nos in occidentis partibus constituti, convenimus ad Aquileiensium civitatem, juxta imperatoris præceptum. Denique etiam præfectus Italiæ litteras dedit, ut si vellent orientales convenire, in potestate haberent: sed quia scierunt consuetudinem hujusmodi, ut in oriente orientalium esset concilium, intra occidentem occidentalium, ideo putaverunt non esse veniendum."

Ambros. Op. tom. ii. p. 806.

[1] "Imperatoribus clementissimis et christianis, beatissimisque princi-

have proved the zeal of your faith, and have laboured to convene a council of bishops, to remove dissensions; and have so far honoured the bishops in your condescension, that no one desirous to be present should be omitted, and that no one who was unwilling should be compelled."

Now, brethren, I beseech you to transfer these proceedings to our day, and mark how utterly repugnant they would be to your modern system.

Would the pope endure the summoning a council by the mandate of any sovereign, to try bishops accused of heresy, without reference to his authority?

Would an assembly of your bishops think it consistent with their obedience, to hold such a council, for such a purpose and under such a warrant?

And if Ambrose, with all his disposition to acknowledge and favour the rights of the Church of Rome, acted and wrote as is here recorded, could he have known anything of the papal prerogative, as laid down in your canon law?

Surely, brethren, I cannot err, in leaving these questions to be answered by any lover of candour and of truth.

pibus Gratiano, Valentiniano et Theodosio, sanctum concilium quod convenit Aquileiæ.

"Benedictus Deus Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui vobis Romanum imperium dedit; et benedictus Dominus noster Jesu Christus unigenitus Dei Filius, qui regnum vestrum sua pietate custodit, apud quem gratias agimus vobis, clementissimi principes, quod et fidei vestræ studium probavistis, qui ad removendas altercationes congregare studuistis sacerdotale concilium, et episcopis dignatione vestra honorificentiam reservastis, ut nemo deesset volens, nemo cogeretur invitus."

CHAPTER XXVII.

Brethren in Christ,

You will doubtless welcome the evidence of Jerome, whose name stands next in order upon our list, since he is so honoured by your canon law, that nothing but favour could be expected at his hands towards the claims of Roman supremacy. Nor is it to be disputed, that in drawing to the close of the fourth century, we find increasing proofs of the advancement of those claims; although they were still very far from the point which they attained at a later day.

To do justice to this witness, I shall first state his strongest declarations in your favour, from his famous letter to pope Damasus; and then present to you his equally celebrated epistle to Evagrius. His comments on the passages of Scripture which you cite as the foundation of your claim will next demand notice; and a few passages in which he calls Rome the mystic Babylon, and treats the peculiar customs of that Church with but small regard, will aid in determining the true aspect of his testimony.

I commence, then, with his letter to pope Damasus, which is as follows: viz. [1] "Jerome to Damasus. Since the east, dashed together by the old madness of the

[1] S. Hieron. Op. om. Ed. Franc. A. D. 1684. Tom. ii. p. 90. "Hieronymus Damaso. Quoniam vetusto Oriens inter se populorum furore

people, tears piecemeal the seamless tunic and coat of the Lord: and the foxes destroy the vine of Christ, as among reservoirs worn out, which hold no water; and it is difficult to understand where the fountain sealed, the garden enclosed, may be found; therefore I have thought it best for me to consult the chair of Peter and the faith praised by the apostle's mouth; asking at this time food for my soul from the same quarter, where formerly I received the garments of Christ. For the vast extent of water and of land which lies between us, cannot keep me from seeking the pearl of price. *Wherever the body is, there are the eagles gathered together.* The prodigal son having wasted his patrimony, the heritage of the fathers is kept safely amongst you alone. There, the ground of the Lord, with its prolific soil, declares its purity by the return of an hundred fold: here, the grain, drowned in the furrows, degenerates into tares and straw. Now, the Sun of righteousness rises in the west: but in the east, that Lucifer who had fallen, has placed his throne above the stars. You are the light of the world, you are the salt of the earth, you are vessels of gold and silver:

collisus, indiscissam Domini tunicam et desupert extam, minutatim perfrustra discerpit: et Christi vineam exterminant vulpes, ut inter lacus contritos, qui aquam non habent, difficile, ubi fons signatus, et hortus ille conclusus sit, possit intelligi: ideo mihi cathedram Petri et fidem apostolico ore laudatam censui consulendam; inde nunc meæ animæ postulans cibum, unde olim Christi vestimenta suscepi. Neque vero tanta vastitas elementi liquentis, et interjacens longitudo terrarum, me a preciosæ margaritæ potuit inquisitione prohibere. *Ubicumque fuerit corpus, illuc congregantur aquilæ.* Profligato a sobole mala patrimonio, apud vos solos incorrupta patrum servatur hæreditas. Ibi cespite terra fœcundo dominici seminis puritatem centeno fructu refert: hic obruta sulcis frumenta in lolium avenasque degenerant. Nunc in occidente Sol justitiæ oritur: in oriente autem Lucifer ille qui ceciderat, supra sidera posuit thronum suum. *Vos estis lux mundi, vos sal terræ,* vos aurea vasa et argentea: hic testacea vasa vel lignea, virgam ferream et æternum operiuntur incendium. Quanquam igitur tui me terreat magnitudo, invitat tamen humanitas. A sacerdote victimam salutis, a pastore præsi-

here, the vessels of earth and wood are shut up for the rod of iron and eternal fire. Notwithstanding, therefore, your greatness deters, yet your kindness invites me. With earnestness, I ask a victim of salvation from the priest, the defence which the sheep requires from the shepherd. Let envy depart: let the ambition of the Roman chief be banished: I speak with the successor of the fisherman, and a disciple of the cross. I who follow no primate except Christ, am united in communion to your blessedness, that is, to the chair of Peter: *on that rock*, I know that *the Church is built*. Whoever eats the lamb out of that house, is profane. If any one was not in the ark of Noah, he must perish in the flood. And because, for my sins, I have dwelt in this wilderness which lies on the boundary between Barbary and Syria, and could not always seek the holy (counsel?) of the Lord from your holiness, through so great an intervening distance: therefore I follow hither your colleagues, the confessors of Egypt; and among the largest vessels, I lie hid in a little boat. I know nothing of Vitalis, of Meletius, or Paulinus. Whoever does not gather with thee, scatters: that is, whoever is not of Christ, is of Antichrist. For now,—O shame!—after the Nicene faith,

dium ovis flagito. Facessat invidia: Romani culminis recedat ambitio: cum successore piscatoris et discipulo crucis loquor. Ego nullum primum, nisi Christum, sequens, beatitudini tuæ, id est, cathedræ Petri communione consocior: *super illam petram ædificatum ecclesiam* scio. Quicumque extra hanc domum agnum comederit, prophanus est. Si quis in arca Noë non fuerit, peribit regnante diluvio. Et quia pro meis facinoribus ad eam solitudinem commigravi, quæ Syriam juncto Barbariæ fine disterminat, nec possum sanctum Domini tot interjacentibus spatiis a sanctimonia tua semper expetere: ideo hic collegas tuos Ægyptios confessores sequor: et sub onerariis navibus, parva navicula delitesco. Non novi Vitalem, Meletium respuo, ignoro Paulinum. Quicumque tecum non colligit, spargit: hoc est, qui Christi non est, Antichristi est. Nunc igitur, proh dolor! post Nicænam fidem, post Alexandrinum juncto pariter Occidente decretum, trium hypostaseon ab Arianorum præsule et

after the Alexandrine decree, the west also concurring, the new phrase of three *hypostases* is exacted of me, a Roman, by the Campenses, and the chief of the Arians. What apostles, I pray, have disclosed these words? What new Paul, the master of the nations, has taught this doctrine? We may ask, what these three *hypostases* are supposed to mean? They say, three subsisting persons. We answer, that we believe this. The sense does not content them, they insist upon the very words: because there lies hid I know not what poison, in the syllables. We cry aloud, If any one does not confess three hypostases, that is, three subsisting persons, let him be anathema. And because we do not pronounce their very words, we are adjudged heretics. But if any one, understanding the word *hypostasis* in the sense of *substance* or *essence*, saith that the hypostasis is not one, in three persons, he is an alien from Christ: and in this confession we are united with you, as though we were branded together."

Here, brethren, you have all that is important of this celebrated document, to which your writers so triumphantly refer. And I do not hesitate to say, that, if maturely considered, it will be found to have no reference whatever to the real question at issue. That question is a question of ecclesiastical polity or government. Your

Campensibus novellum a me homine Romano nomen exigitur. Qui quæso ista Apostoli prodidere? Quis novus magister gentium Paulus hæc docuit? Interrogemus, quid tres hypostases posse arbitrentur intelligi? Tres personas subsistentes aiunt. Respondemus, nos ita credere. Non sufficit sensus, ipsum nomen efflagitant: quia nescio quid veneni in syllabis latet. Clamamus, si quis tres hypostases, aut tria enypostata, hoc est, tres subsistentes personas non confitetur, anathema sit. Et quia vocabula non ediscimus, hæretici judicamur. Si quis autem hypostasin usian intelligens, non in tribus personis unam hypostasin dicit, alienus a Christo est: et sub hac confessione vobiscum pariter cauterio unionis inurimur."

doctrine is, that the Church was built on Peter, personally and officially, as being the constituted chief and ruler, the vicar of Christ, to whom was committed the whole Church, apostles and all: that his supreme authority was transferred to his successors in the Roman see, which thenceforward became, by virtue of this transfer, the mother and mistress of all the Churches: and that, by necessary consequence, the being in communion with the Church of Rome, *as such*, is essential to the being a member of the catholic Church. Whereas I shall show you, distinctly, that Jerome did not hold your construction of the Saviour's address to Peter: that, on the contrary, he held the same which the fathers in general had held before him: viz. that the Church was built, *not* on Peter *personally*, *but on the faith which he professed*: that, in consistency with this opinion, the expressions on which you rely, in the above document, were not intended by Jerome to mean a personal communion with Damasus, as being the official successor of Peter—the pope of Rome—but a communion with him in that faith of Peter, on which the Church was built; which faith, the eastern Church, in the days of Jerome, had suffered to be almost overcome by Arianism, while the western Church had continued to hold it uncorrupted and pure.

You will probably think that I have undertaken a rash enterprise. Give me your patient attention, brethren, and I promise you that it shall have a successful issue. It is only necessary that we examine Jerome's declarations in other parts of his works, and then we shall be able to do him justice in the interpretation of the place in question: for I hold it to be a sound rule, that as far as possible, we must construe every author, so that he shall not appear to contradict himself.

I ask you, then, to turn to the epistle to Evagrius, which Calvin and his disciples have praised as loudly as

your writers have lauded the other. And here we shall have a better view of Jerome's sentiments, because the very point of this epistle was one of *ecclesiastical polity*, whereas the burden of his letter to Damasus was a question of *faith alone*. The deacons of the Church of Rome, as you are aware, being limited to the number seven, had become arrogant and assuming, preferring themselves before the presbyters. Jerome reproves their presumption, and takes occasion to enlarge on the offices of bishop, priest, and deacon, with their relative powers; especially declaring his opinion as to the comparative authority of the Church of Rome. Of course, therefore, the very topic naturally led to the point under discussion; so that the sentiments of Jerome, when the epistle to Evagrius is well weighed, can hardly be mistaken.

The passages important to the argument are as follows, viz:

[1] "The Church of Rome is not to be thought one thing, and that of the whole world another. Gaul, and Britain, and Africa, and Persia, and the East, and Judea, and all the barbarian nations, adore also one Christ, and observe the same rule of truth. IF AUTHORITY IS SOUGHT FOR, THE WORLD IS GREATER THAN ONE CITY. *Wherever there is a bishop, whether at Rome, or Eugubium, or Constanti-*

[1] Hieron. Op. tom. ii. p. 221. "Hieronymus Evagrio.

——— "Nec altera Romanæ urbis Ecclesia, altera totius orbis existimanda est. Et Galliæ et Britanniæ et Africa et Persis et Oriens et India et omnes barbaræ nationes unum Christum adorant, unam observant regulam veritatis. Si autoritas quæritur, orbis major est urbe. Ubicumque fuerit Episcopus, sive Romæ sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopolis, sive Rhegii, sive Alexandriæ, sive Tanis: ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est et sacerdotii. Potentia divitiarum, et paupertatis humilitas, vel sublimiorem vel inferiorem Episcopum non facit. Cæterum omnes apostolorum successores sunt. Sed dicis, quomodo Romæ ad testimonium diaconi presbyter ordinatur? Quid mihi profers unius urbis consuetudinem?"

nople, or Rhegium, or Alexandria, or Tanis: HE IS OF THE SAME EXCELLENCY, OF THE SAME EPISCOPATE. The power of wealth and the lowliness of poverty does not make a bishop either less or greater. For they are all the successors of the apostles. But you say, how is it that at Rome a presbyter is ordained upon the testimony of a deacon? Why do you urge to me the custom of a single city?" The conclusion of the epistle is in these words[1]: "And that we may know the apostolic traditions to have been drawn from the Old Testament, what Aaron and his sons and the Levites were in the temple, the same let the bishops, the presbyters, and the deacons, claim to themselves in the Church."

I shall not detain you by any remarks on this decisive passage, until I present to your attention the important testimony of our witness on the fundamental question; viz. how he considered the Church, as built on Peter. And here brethren, you will perhaps be somewhat surprised when you examine the proof which this *most blessed* of the fathers (according to your canon law) will afford us.

[2] "You say," says Jerome, "that the Church is founded on Peter, *although the same thing is elsewhere done upon all the apostles, and all receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven, so that the strength of the Church is consolidated upon them all alike:* nevertheless, on this account one is elected amongst the twelve, in order that a head being constituted, the occasion of schism might

[1] Ib. "Et ut sciamus traditiones apostolicas sumptas de Veteri Testamento, quod Aaron et filii ejus atque Levitæ in templo fuerunt, hoc sibi Episcopi et presbyteri et diaconi vendicent in Ecclesia."

[2] Hieron. adversus Jovinianum, lib. 1. Op. om. tom. ii. p. 26. H.

"At dicis, super Petrum fundata est Ecclesia, licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat; et cuncti claves regni cœlorum accipiant, et ex æquo super eos Ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur: tamen propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut capite constituto, schismatis tollatur occasio."

be taken away." In this passage we have the same doctrine that Cyprian laid down, though not so strongly. Jerome was a presbyter of the Church of Rome, and in that quarter, the primacy of Peter and its derivation to the pope of Rome might be expected to appear, in their most imposing form. Yet even here, your witness asserts a perfect equality amongst the apostles in the fundamental point of the building of the Church upon them, and the giving them the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

Again, in his commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew, we read as follows:

[1] "On this rock the Lord founded his Church, from this rock the apostle Peter obtained his name."—"The foundation which the apostle as an architect laid, is one, our Lord Jesus Christ: upon this foundation the Church of Christ is built."

Again, in his commentary on the very words addressed by our Lord to Peter, Jerome declares[2]: "As the Lord gave light to the apostles, that they might be called the light of the world, so did they obtain other names from him: thus on Simon who believed in the rock Christ, the name of Peter is bestowed. And according to the metaphor of a rock, it is rightly said to him: I will build my Church on thee."

[1] Hieron. Com. in Matthæum. Cap. vii. v. 61.

"*Fundata enim,* &c.] Super hanc petram Dominus fundavit Ecclesiam, ab hac petra Apostolus Petrus sortitus est nomen.

"*Qui ædificavit,* &c.] Fundamentum quod Apostolus architectus posuit, unus est Dominus noster Jesus Christus: super hoc fundamentum ædificatur Christi Ecclesia."

[2] Ib. cap. xvi.

"*Et ego dico tibi, quia tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam.*] Sicut ipse lumen Apostolis donavit, ut lumen mundi appellarentur, cæteraque ex Domino sortiti sunt vocabula, ita et Simoni qui credebat in petram Christum, Petri largitus est nomen. Ac secundum metaphoram petræ, recte dicitur ei: *Ædificabo Ecclesiam meam super te.*"

Upon the words which follow: *And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it*, Jerome saith, [1] "I think the gates of hell are the vices and sins of men; or certainly the doctrines of heretics, by which men being allured are led to destruction."

Upon the words, "*I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven*," Jerome's commentary is worthy of your particular notice. [2] "Bishops and presbyters," saith he, "not understanding this passage, assume to themselves something of the superciliousness of the Pharisees, thinking that they can condemn the innocent and absolve the guilty, when, before God, it is not the sentence of the priests, but the life of the accused that is required. We read in Leviticus," continues he, "of the lepers, where they are ordered to show themselves to the priests, and if they had the leprosy, then the priest should pronounce them unclean; not that the priest could make them leprous and unclean; but that they might have notice of those who were lepers and those who were not, and might be able to discern between the clean and the unclean. In the same manner, therefore, as the priest then announced the clean and the unclean, so now the bishop and the presbyter do not bind or loose those who

[1] "*Et portæ inferi non prævalebunt adversus eam*] Ego portas inferi reor vitia atque peccata, vel certe hæreticorum doctrinas, per quas illecti homines ducuntur ad tartarum."

[2] "*Et dabo tibi claves regni cœlorum, &c.*] Istum locum episcopi et presbyteri non intelligentes, aliquid sibi de Pharisæorum assumunt supercilio, ut vel damnent innocentes, vel solvere se noxios arbitrentur, cum apud Deum non sententia sacerdotum, sed reorum vita quæratur. Legimus in Levitico de leprosis, ubi jubentur ut ostendant se sacerdotibus, et si lepram habuerint, tunc a sacerdote immundi fiant, non quo sacerdotes leprosos faciant et immundos, sed quo habeant notitiam leprosi et non leprosi, et possint discernere qui mundus, quive immundus sit. Quomodo ergo ibi leprosum sacerdos mundum vel immundum facit, sic et hic alligat, vel solvit episcopus et presbyter, non eos qui insontes sunt vel noxii, sed pro officio suo, cum peccatorum audierit varietates, scit qui ligandus sit, quive solvendus."

are innocent or guilty, but by virtue of their office, when they hear the varieties of sins, they know who should be bound, or who should be loosed." I have translated these passages as literally as possible. The latter sentence, especially, might be better arranged, but the meaning of Jerome is sufficiently plain.

We have not yet, however, closed this important witness's testimony, but shall ask your attention to some farther extracts bearing on the point in question.

In his commentary on St. Paul's epistle to Titus, he saith: [1] "It belongs to the apostolic dignity to lay the foundation of the Church, which no one should lay except the architect. But there is no other foundation besides Jesus Christ: where that foundation is laid, inferior workmen may carry on the building."

And again: arguing strongly that bishop and presbyter were at the beginning but different names for the same office, and that the distinction was introduced for the purpose of preventing schism, he uses the following language: [2] "Peter, who received his name from the firmness of his faith, in his epistle, saith: *The presbyters who are among you, I who am your fellow presbyter, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and a companion of the glory which is to be revealed hereafter, beseech you, feed the flock of the Lord among you, not as if by constraint, but wil-*

[1] Hieron. Com. in Epist. ad Titum, cap. 1.

"*Hujus rei, &c.*] Apostolicæ dignitatis est Ecclesiæ jacere fundamentum, quod nemo ponere, nisi Architectus. Fundamentum autem non est aliud præter Christum Jesum. Qui inferiores artifices sunt, hi possunt ædes super fundamenta construere."

[2] Ib. "Et Petrus qui ex fidei firmitate nomen accepit, in Epistola sua loquitur dicens: *Presbyteros ergo in vobis obsecro compresbyter, et testis Christi passionum, qui et ejus gloriæ quæ in futuro revelanda est socius sum, pascite eum qui in vobis gregem Domini, non quasi cum necessitate, sed voluntarie.* Hæc propterea, ut ostenderemus apud veteres eosdem fuisse presbyteros quos et Episcopos, paulatim vero ut dissensionum plantaria evellerentur, ad unum omnem sollicitudinem esse delatam. Sicut ergo pres-

lingly. Here we show," continues Jerome, "that with the ancients, presbyters and bishops were the same; but by degrees, in order that the plants of dissension might be rooted up, the care of government was committed to one. Therefore, as the presbyters know themselves by the custom of the Church to be subject to him who may be set over them, so should the bishops know that they are superior to the presbyters more by custom than by the truth of our Lord's disposition, and that they ought to govern the Church in common; imitating Moses, who, when he had it in his power to preside alone over Israel, chose seventy men with whom he might judge the people."

I do not undertake to defend this opinion of Jerome, brethren, because I believe the episcopacy deserves to be placed on far higher ground than the mere custom of the Church. But the passage is important as exhibiting the construction which ought to be affixed to other parts of his works. And you will perceive at once, that an author who thus argued for the original equality of bishops and presbyters, and reduced the whole episcopal power of government to the custom of the Church, without divine right, could never, in fairness, be suspected of teaching, that the bishop of Rome, by the express gift of Christ to Peter, held "*a plenitude of power*," not only over his own presbyters, but over all the bishops, priests, deacons, and laity, throughout the whole Christian world.

A few quotations of another character will show Jerome's regard for Rome in a light but poorly adapted to sustain your doctrine. Thus, in his preface to the trea-

byteri sciunt se ex Ecclesiæ consuetudine ei qui sibi præpositus fuerit esse subjectos, ita Episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine quam dispositionis dominicæ veritate, presbyteris esse majores, et in commune debere Ecclesiam regere, imitantes Moysen, qui cum haberet in potestate solus præesse populo Israel, septuaginta elegit cum quibus populum judicaret."

tise on the Holy Spirit, addressed to his friend Paulinian, he uses the following expressions: [1] "When I was a dweller in Babylon, a tenant of the scarlet whore, and living after the rule of the Roman citizens, I had a desire to prate somewhat concerning the Holy Spirit; and the work being begun, I designed to dedicate it to the pontiff of that city."

Strange language this, brethren, from the *most blessed* of the fathers. But it is not the only instance, for I shall show you another more positive and sober declaration of the same kind. In his epistle to Marcella, where he argues in favour of a solitary life, and especially recommends her to leave Rome, and take up her residence at Bethlehem, the birth-place of the Saviour; he saith: [2] "This is a far holier place, as I think, than the Tarpeian rock, which the frequent stroke of the thunderbolt proves to have displeased the Lord. Read the Apocalypse of John, and behold what he declares of the scarlet woman, on whose forehead were written blasphemies; of the seven hills, of many waters, and of going out from Babylon. *Go out from her, my people, saith the Lord, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that you receive not of her plagues. Fly ye from the midst of Babylon, and save every one of you his own soul. She*

[1] S. Hieron. ad Paulinianum in Lib. Didymi de Spir. Sanc. præfatio.

"Cum in Babylone versarer, et purpuratæ meretricis essem colonus, et jure Quiritum viverem, volui garrire aliquid de Spiritu Sancto, et cœptum opusculum, ejusdem urbis Pontifici dedicare."

[2] S. Hieron. ad Marcellam, Op. om. tom. i. p. 82.

"*Et hic* [nempe Bethlehem] *puto locus sanctior est Tarpeia rupe*, quæ de cœlo sæpius fulminata ostendit, quod Domino displiceret. Lege Apocalypsim Joannis, et quid de *muliere purpurata*, et scripta in ejus fronte blasphemia, septem montibus, aquis multis, et Babylonis cantetur exitu, contuere. *Exite, inquit Dominus, de illa populus meus, et ne participes sitis delictorum ejus, et de plagis ejus non accipiatis. Fugite de medio Babylonis, et salvate unusquisque animam suam. Cecidit enim, cecidit Babylon magna, et facta est habitatio Dæmonum, et custodia Spiritus immundi.*

has fallen, she has fallen, the great Babylon, and is become a habitation of demons, and a watch-tower of the unclean spirit. There, indeed, is a holy Church, there are the trophies of the apostles and martyrs, there is a true confession of Christ, there is the faith preached by the apostles, and there, while heathenism is trodden down, the Christian profession is daily erecting itself on high: but ambition, power, the vastness of the city, the passion to see and to be seen, to salute and to be saluted, to praise and to calumniate, to hear or to speak, with the necessity of seeing such a crowd of people, however unwillingly, these things are quite foreign to the quiet and design of monks. For either we must see those who come to visit us, and thereby lose the benefits of silence; or we must refuse to see them, and thereby be accused of pride. And if we return the visits, we present ourselves to scornful doors; and enter the gilded posts amongst the tongues of back-biting menials."

I shall not trouble you, brethren, with any disquisition upon the question, whether Jerome meant to apply the language of the Apocalypse to heathen, or to Christian Rome. Certain it is, however, that he wrote those passages nearly one hundred years after Christianity had triumphed in the imperial city, and at a time when he could with truth assert, as we see he did, that "*heathenism was trodden down.*" But if he had

Est quidem ibi sancta Ecclesia, sunt trophæa Apostolorum et martyrum, est Christi vera confessio, est ab Apostolo prædicata fides, et gentilitate calcata, in sublime se quotidie erigens vocabulum Christianum: sed ipsa ambitio, potentia, magnitudo urbis, videri et videre, salutari et salutare, laudare et detrahere, vel audire vel proloqui, et tantam frequentiam hominum saltem invitum videre, a proposito monachorum et quiete aliena sunt. Aut enim videmus venientes ad nos, et silentium perdimus, aut non videmus, et superbiæ arguimur. Interdumque ut visitantibus reddamus vicem, ad superbas fores pergimus, et inter linguas rodentium ministrorum postes ingredimur auratos."

believed that the vicar of Christ, the pastor and ruler of the whole Christian world, had his seat at Rome, in that Church which was the mother and mistress of all the others, is it conceivable that he could have thus expressed himself, without one redeeming word of veneration? Or could you imagine an orthodox presbyter of your Church, distinguished as Jerome was, for piety and learning, delivering such sentiments at the present day?

Another instance of our author's disregard to the superior authority of the Church of Rome, occurs in the following passages, addressed to his friend Lucinius.

[1] "As to your questions concerning the sabbath, whether it is lawful to fast on it, and concerning the eucharist, whether it should be taken every day, as the Churches of Rome and of Spain are said to practise, Hippolytus, truly a very learned man, has written, and several others, here and there, have also published opinions, from various authors. But I think it best briefly to admonish you, that the ecclesiastical traditions, (especially those which do not meddle with faith) are to be observed, as the elders have delivered them. Nor should the custom of some be subverted by the contrary mode of others."

[2] "Nor do I say this because I think it proper to fast

[1] Hieron. ad Lucinium, ib. p. 126. A. "De sabbato quod quæris, utrum jejunandum sit, et de eucharistia, an accipienda quotidie, quod Romanæ Ecclesiæ et Hispaniæ observare perhibentur, scripsit quidem et Hippolytus vir disertissimus, et carptim diversi scriptores e variis autoribus edidere. Sed ego illud te breviter admonendum puto, traditiones Ecclesiasticas [præsertim quæ fidei non officiant] ita observandas, ut a majoribus traditæ sunt. Nec aliorum consuetudinem aliorum contrario more subverti."

[2] Ib. "Nec hoc dico quod dominicis jejunandum putem, et contextas sexaginta diebus ferias auferam, sed unaquæque provincia abundet in sensu suo, et præcepta majorum leges Apostolicas arbitretur."

on the dominical days, or because I wish to take away the holydays of the sixty successive days, but let each province be satisfied with its own way, and esteem the precepts of the elders as the laws of the apostles themselves."

In these passages, the equal rights of all the Churches, and the total absence of deference towards Rome, appear plainly; and fully accord with the general strain of our author's testimony.

Now then, let us turn, if you please, to your favourite, the epistle of Jerome to Damasus, and see whether it conflicts with the various quotations which I have set before you. It commences with a reference to the distracted state of the eastern Church, in consequence of the prevalence of Arianism, so that it was difficult to know where to find the true faith amongst them. From the east, therefore, Jerome turns to the west, to that Rome in which he had become a presbyter some years before, and whose bishop he was desirous to propitiate, in order to secure a kind and favourable reception. He introduces a comparison between the Churches in the east and the west, by a recurrence to our Lord's parable of the prodigal son. He then alludes strongly to the reasons for his former disgust, by saying, "Let envy depart: let the ambition of the Roman chief be banished. I speak with the successor of the fisherman, and a disciple of the cross. I, who follow no primate except Christ, *am united in communion to your blessedness*, that is, *to the chair of Peter. On that rock I know that the Church is built; whoever eats the lamb out of that house is profane.* If any one was not in the ark of Noah he must perish in the flood."—"*Whoever does not gather with thee, scatters:* that is, whoever is not of Christ is of antichrist. For now—O shame?—after the Nicene faith, after the Alexandrian decree, the west also concurring, the new phrase of *three hypostases* is exacted of me, a Roman, by the chief of the Arians," &c.

The whole question, here, turns upon the sense of the words I have italicised. Whether Jerome meant to say that the Church was built on the chair of Peter, or on the confession, the faith of Peter, which the council of Nice had acknowledged as the faith of the catholic or universal Church, and which the chair of Peter, (that is, in the style of Jerome's days, the Church of Rome) had retained, this is the only point at issue. And perhaps I cannot do better, with regard to it, than refer you to the Scholium which your truly great Erasmus has appended to the very passage. [1] "NOT UPON ROME," was the Church built, "as I think," saith this celebrated commentator. "For it might happen that Rome also should degenerate; but upon that faith which Peter professed, and which hitherto the Roman Church has preserved, by which alone she has been less troubled with heresies."

And on the following words of Jerome, "*Out of this house, whoever eats the lamb is profane,*" the same distinguished critic observes: [2] "Here, truly, Jerome *seems* to think, that all the Churches should be subject to the Roman see, or at least, not to be separated from that Church, which particularly glories in the apostle who held the primacy among the rest; and which is therefore orthodox, as standing in the first dignity of the orthodox

[1] Hieron. Op. tom. ii. 91. Epist. Hieron. ad Damasum Scholia. "*Super illam petram.*] Non super Romam, ut arbitror. Nam fieri potest, ut Roma quoque degeneret; sed super eam fidem, quam Petrus professus est, et quam hactenus Romana servavit Ecclesia, qua non alia minus laboravit hæresibus."

[2] Ibid. "*Extra hanc domum.*] Hic Hieronymus omnino videtur sentire, omnes ecclesias debere subesse Romanæ sedi, aut certe ab hac non alienas, quæ peculiariter hoc apostolo gloriatur, qui inter apostolos primas tenuit: et sic est orthodoxa, ut sit orthodoxarum prima dignitate. Allusit autem ad domum, in qua Christus cum duodecim apostolis comedit agnum paschalem. Et quod legitur Exodi duodecimo de esu phasæ: In una domo comedetur, nec efferetis de carnibus ejus foras."

Churches. But Jerome alluded," continues Erasmus, "to the house in which Christ, with the twelve apostles, ate the paschal lamb. And he referred to what we read in the twelfth chapter of Exodus respecting the eating of the passover: It shall be eaten in one house, nor shall ye carry any portion of its flesh out of doors."

In accordance, then, brethren, with one of your own most eminent scholars, I am justified in saying, that the communion to which Jerome alluded throughout this epistle was a communion *in the orthodox faith, as opposed to the heresy of Arius.* He had left Rome, in disgust; and had repaired to the eastern Church, in order to enjoy the peace and retirement of monastic life. But the eastern Church becomes torn by heresy, his peace is destroyed, his faith is impeached, and he desires to return to his former habitation. Addressing himself to the Roman bishop, he relates the facts, compares the state of the two Churches, and tells Damasus that the western Church was now the salt of the earth, the light of the world. I am not in communion with these heretical Arians, saith he, our faith is not the same. But I am in communion with thee, for thou holdest the faith of Peter, together with his chair. On that faith—that rock—I know that the Church is built, out of which Church whoever eateth the lamb is profane. For that Church is as the ark, which alone preserved the family of Noah from the deluge. Whoever does not gather with thee, by a communion in this true faith, scatters: since without this faith, he cannot be of Christ, and therefore must needs be of Antichrist.

To show still more clearly, that this is the true exposition of Jerome's meaning, let me remind you of the expressions with which he so carefully guards his independence. "Let envy depart," saith he: "Let the ambition of the Roman chief be banished. I speak with the

successor of the fisherman, and a disciple of the cross. I follow no primate but Christ." For what purpose, I beseech you, were these words written, if Jerome intended to acknowledge pope Damasus as the "*vicar of Christ*," holding the place, "*not of a mere man, but of the true God upon the earth*," according to your canon law? Had such been his meaning, would he not have said so? Since his very object was to ingratiate himself with the pope, and obtain an honourable recal from his self-imposed exile, would not every motive induce him to employ the strongest language of devotion to the ROMAN CHIEF, which his real sentiments could possibly allow?

But this is not the greatest difficulty which your construction of the epistle has to overcome. According to your hypothesis, the Church of Rome was appointed, by divine authority, to be the mother and mistress of all the Churches—the head of the Church throughout the world. Of course, then, the eastern Church, in departing from the faith of her mother and mistress, had committed a grievous trespass on the established system of God, of which system, Jerome was an advocate and upholder. But if all this were so, why does he not mention it in his epistle? Why does he compare the eastern and western Churches to the *two brothers* in the parable of the prodigal son, instead of saying that they stood in the mutual relation of *parent and child?* Why does he accuse the eastern Church of persisting in their error, after the council of Nice had pronounced their judgment against the Arian heresy, instead of charging them with the far deeper sin of treason against the divine authority of the Roman see?

Above all, however, brethren, let me beg you to consider, that your construction of this single epistle requires us to set Jerome against himself, and to adopt a doubtful comment upon one passage, in the very face of the re-

mainder of his testimony. For have we not heard our witness expressly declaring, in his epistle to Evagrius, that the authority of the Church of Rome was not to be followed in preference to the rest of the Churches; that all bishops were equal in office and in excellency, whether they were of Rome, or Eugubium, or Constantinople, or Rhegium, or Alexandria, or Tanis: that every bishop should consider himself as Aaron, and the presbyters as Aaron's sons, and the deacons as Levites? Of course, then, there could be no superior over any bishop except Christ, since there was no other high-priest over Aaron —the very doctrine, in substance, which Cyprian had delivered more than two centuries before.

Again: have we not heard Jerome expounding the Scriptures in manifest contradiction to your doctrine; asserting positively that what our Lord did for Peter he afterwards did for the others; that the Church was built upon all the apostles, and that all received the keys of the kingdom of heaven? Have we not even heard him reducing the very power of the keys to so moderate a measure, that if you held the same opinion as Jerome, you would hardly think it worth a controversy?

Again: have we not heard our witness insisting that bishops and presbyters in the beginning held the same office, and strongly arguing that for this reason, bishops, in his days, should know themselves to be above presbyters, rather by the custom of the Church than by any divine constitution? And this he states with regard to *all bishops*. How then should he have imagined, that such a pre-eminence had been designed, by Christ himself, for the bishop of Rome?

Again: have we not heard your favourite Jerome applying that most offensive of all Scriptural figures—the scarlet whore, and Babylon—to Rome, in his own days; urging his friend Marcella to leave it, in the language of

the Apocalypse: "Go out from her, my people, saith the Lord, that ye be not partaker of her sins?"

And lastly: have we not heard him advise Lucinius not to regard the customs of Rome, on the subject of fasting on the sabbath, and the daily reception of the eucharist, if it differed from the other Churches, saying, "let each province be satisfied with its own way?"

I doubt not, brethren, that I may err, as all men are liable to do, in my estimate of the force of evidence on the minds of others. But I confess myself perfectly unable to conceive, how the testimony of this important witness, taken as a whole, can be brought into accordance with your system. His vast learning, his zeal for celibacy, his devotion to monachism, and his letter to pope Damasus, have combined to place him in the high rank which he has obtained upon your calendar. And I am willing to add that his candour, his sincerity, and his zeal for what he believed to be the truth, are worthy of all praise. For myself I can freely say, that I regard his works with peculiar admiration; and am well persuaded, that if the Church of Rome would consent to a thorough adoption of the sentiments of Jerome, there would be very little material for serious controversy remaining [1].

[1] Having promised, when I arrived at the testimony of Jerome, to place before you his specification of the errors of Origen, I subjoin an extract from his Epistle to Pammachius, on that subject:

"Et primum de libro περὶ ἀρχῶν, ubi loquitur [sc. Origenes]: Sicut enim incongruum est dicere, quod possit Filius videre Patrem: ita inconveniens est opinari, quod Spiritus Sanctus possit videre Filium. Secundum, quod in hoc corpore quasi in carcere sunt animæ religatæ: et antequam homo fieret in paradiso, inter rationabiles creaturas in cœlestibus commoratæ sunt. Unde postea in consolationem suam anima loquitur in Psalmis; *Priusquam humiliarer, ego deliqui.* Et: *Revertere anima mea in requiem tuam.* Et: *Educ de carcere animam meam;* et cætera his similia. Tertium, quod dicat, et diabolum et dæmones acturos pœnitentiam aliquando, et cum sanctis ultimo tempore

regnaturos. Quartum, quod tunicas pelliceas humana corpora interpretetur, quibus post offensam et ejectionem de paradiso Adam et Eva induti sunt, haud dubium, quin ante in paradiso sine carne, nervis, et ossibus fuerint. Quintum, quod carnis resurrectionem membrorumque compagem, et sexum, quo viri dividimur a fœminis, apertissime neget: tam in explanatione primi psalmi, quam in aliis multis tractatibus. Sextum, quod sic paradisum allegorizet, ut historiæ auferat veritatem, pro arboribus Angelos, pro fluminibus virtutes cœlestes intelligens, totamque paradisi continentiam tropologica interpretatione subvertat. Septimum, quod aquas, quæ super cœlos in Scripturis esse dicuntur, sanctas supernasque virtutes: quæ supra terram et infra terram, contrarias et dæmoniacas esse arbitrentur. Octavum, quod extremum objicit, imaginem et similitudinem Dei, ad quam homo conditus fuerat, dicit ab eo perditam, et in homine post paradisum non fuisse." Hieron. ad Pammachium adversus errores Joan. Hierosolym. Op. om. tom. ii. p. 112. F.

There are several other parts of the works of Jerome, where he enumerates the errors of Origen, but none, as I think, which is more satisfactory than the preceding. Perfectly plain it is, that there is nothing in the list of Jerome's censures which concerns the subject of my humble volume; and therefore, the testimony which I have adduced from Origen stands fully accredited, by the very language of your canon law. See page 12.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

A BRIGHTER name than that of St. Augustin, can hardly be found in the annals of the Church since the apostolic day; nor is there one whose authority you are disposed to venerate more highly. Let us next turn to his testimony, and ascertain how he interpreted those passages of the word of God, on which your system is supposed to rest.

And first, with regard to the apostle Peter being the foundation of the Church, it appears that Augustin in one of his earlier works, while yet a presbyter, expressed an affirmative sentiment, but afterwards abandoned it, and thenceforward maintained the contrary. This we learn from his "Retractations," where his account of the matter is as follows:

[1] "I wrote a book against the epistle of Donatus," saith he, "while I was a presbyter, in which I said, in a

[1] S. Augustini Op. om. Editio Benedict. tom. i. p. 23. Retract. lib. i. c. xxi. § i. "Librum contra epistolam Donati . . . . . eodem presbyterii mei tempore scripsi, ... in quo dixi in quodam loco de apostolo Petro, quod in illo tamquam in petra fundata sit ecclesia . . . . Sed scio me postea sæpissime sic exposuisse quod a Domino dictum est, *Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam:* ut super hunc intelligeretur quem confessus est Petrus dicens, *Tu es Christus filius Dei vivi:* ac sic Petrus ab hac petra appellatus personam Ecclesiæ figuraret,

certain place, concerning the apostle Peter, that the Church was built on him, as on a rock .... But I know that very frequently afterwards I expounded our Lord's saying: *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church*, so that it might be understood to mean: Upon him whom thou, Peter, hast confessed, saying, Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God: and so Peter, being named from this rock, would represent the person of the Church, which is built upon this rock, and received the keys of the kingdom of heaven. For it was not said to him, Thou art a rock: but, *Thou art Peter.* The rock was Christ, whom Simon having confessed, as the whole Church confesses him, was called Peter."

A few other extracts will assist in showing the opinion of our witness more clearly. Thus in his treatise upon Christian Doctrine, Augustin has these words, viz. [1] "He gave those keys therefore to his Church, in order that those things which she should loose on earth, should be loosed in heaven, and that those which she should bind on earth should be bound in heaven: that is to say, whoever should not believe that sins would be remitted to him in his Church, they would not be remitted; but whoever should believe, and being reformed should turn himself away from his transgressions, being settled in the bosom of his Church, should be healed by that faith and reforma-

quæ super hanc petram ædificatur, et accepit claves regni cœlorum. Non enim dictum est illi, Tu es petra: sed, *Tu es Petrus.* Petra autem erat Christus, quem confessus Simon, sicut eum tota Ecclesia confitetur, dictus est Petrus."

[1] Ib. tom. iii. p. 8. De Doctrina Christiana, lib. i. c. xvii. "Has igitur claves dedit Ecclesiæ suæ, ut quæ solveret in terra, soluta essent in cœlo, quæ ligaret in terra, ligata essent in cœlo: scilicet ut quisquis in Ecclesia ejus dimitti sibi peccata non crederet, non ei dimitterentur; quisquis autem crederet, seque ab his correctus averteret, in ejusdem Ecclesiæ gremio constitutus, eadem fide atque correctione sanaretur. Quisquis enim non credit dimitti sibi posse peccata, fit deterior desperando."

tion. For whoever does not believe that his sins may be remitted, becomes worse through despair."

Here you have a doctrine, brethren, closely resembling what we have previously found in Origen and others, giving the power of the keys to each individual, as soon as he becomes united with the Church of Christ, so that, being once baptized, repentance and faith are sufficient for every subsequent remission of sins, without recurrence to the priestly office of absolution. But the importance of the subject may demand, though at the cost of some repetition, a few passages more from our distinguished author.

Thus, in his discourse upon the 21st chapter of the Gospel of St. John, he enlarges upon the gift of the keys to Peter, in the following words: viz. [1] "And since those also who are walking in the Lord are not without sins, which steal upon them unawares, through the infirmity of this life, he gave them the salutary remedies of mercy, by which their prayer might be assisted, where he taught them to say, *Forgive us our debts, even as we also forgive our debtors.* This thing, with a blessed hope, the Church performs in this miserable life; of which Church the apostle Peter, by reason of the primacy of his apostolate, bore the person in a figurative universality. For with regard to what belonged to himself, by nature

[1] Ib. tom. iii. pars secunda, p. 599. c. In Johan. Evang. cap. 21. Tract. 124. § 5. "Et quia in ipso quoque ambulantes non sunt sine peccatis, quæ de hujus vitæ infirmitate subrepunt, dedit eleemosynarum remedia salutaria, quibus eorum adjuvaretur oratio, ubi eos dicere docuit, Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris. Hoc agit ecclesia spe beata in hac vita ærumnosa: cujus Ecclesiæ Petrus apostolus, propter Apostolatus sui primatum, gerebat figurata generalitate personam. Quod enim ad ipsum proprie pertinet, natura unus homo erat, gratia unus Christianus, abundantiore gratia unus idemque primus apostolus; sed quando ei dictum est, *Tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum, et quodcumque ligaveris super terram, erit ligatum et in cœlis, et quodcumque solveris super terram, erit solutum et in cœlis,* universam significabat Ecclesiam, quæ in hoc sæculo diversis tentationibus velut imbribus, fluminibus,

he was a man, by grace he was a Christian, by more abundant grace he was one and the first apostle: but when it was said to him, *I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven*, he signified the Church universal, which in this world is shaken by divers temptations, as by rains, floods, and tempests, and yet falls not, because it is founded upon the rock from which Peter received his name. For the rock was not named from Peter, but Peter from the rock; even as Christ is not named from Christian, but Christian from Christ. Moreover the Lord saith, *Upon this rock I will build my Church*, because Peter had said, *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God*. Upon this rock, therefore, which thou hast confessed, I will build my Church. For the rock was Christ; upon which foundation Peter himself also was built. For another foundation can no man lay, besides that which has been laid, Christ Jesus. The Church therefore which is built on Christ, received the keys of the kingdom of heaven in Peter, that is, the power of binding and loosing sins."

Again, saith this eminent master in Israel, [1] "What does this saying mean, *Upon this rock I will build my*

tempestatibus quatitur, et non cadit, quoniam fundata est super petram, unde Petrus nomen accepit. Non enim a Petro petra, sed Petrus a petra; sicut non Christus a Christiano, sed Christianus a Christo vocatur. Ideo quippe ait Dominus, Super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam, quia dixerat Petrus: Tu es Christus Filius Dei vivi. Super hanc ergo, inquit, petram quam confessus es, ædificabo ecclesiam meam. Petra enim erat Christus; super quod fundamentum etiam ipse ædificatus est Petrus. Fundamentum quippe aliud nemo potest ponere præter id quod positum est, quod est, Christus Jesus. Ecclesia ergo quæ fundatur in Christo, claves ab eo regni cœlorum accepit in Petro, id est, potestatem ligandi solvendique peccata."

[1] Ib. 651. B. "Quid est, super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam? Super hanc fidem, super id quod dictum est, Tu es Christus Filius Dei vivi."

Church? Upon this faith, upon that which was spoken, *Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.*"

And again: Augustin presents the same idea paraphrastically, in the following lively manner: [1] "*And I say unto thee, Thou art Peter:* because I am a rock (petra), thou art Peter (Petrus); for the rock is not from Peter, but Peter from the rock, as Christ is not from Christian, but Christian from Christ. *And upon this rock I will build my Church:* not upon Peter, which thou art; but upon the rock which thou hast confessed: but *I will build my Church;* I will build THEE, who in this answer bearest the figure of the Church."

It is surely impossible, brethren, after reading these multiplied proofs, to avoid understanding the settled and matured interpretations which this celebrated teacher attached to your favourite text. And yet it is worth remarking, that he does not confine his idea of the apostles' representing the Church, to the case of Peter. For I find him extending the same representative capacity to the person of the apostle John, in a beautiful passage, which I cannot deny myself the pleasure of placing before you.

[2] "Nevertheless," saith our witness, "let no one separate these distinguished apostles. In that which Peter signified, they were together: and in that which John

[1] Ib. tom. v. p. 764. E. "*Et ego dico tibi, Tu es Petrus:* quia ego petra, tu Petrus; neque enim a Petro petra, sed a petra Petrus: quia non a Christiano Christus, sed a Christo Christianus. *Et super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam:* non super Petrum, quod tu es; sed supra petram, quam confessus es. *Ædificabo* autem *Ecclesiam meam;* ædificabo te, qui in hac responsione figuram gestas Ecclesiæ."

[2] Ib. 600. F. "Nemo tamen istos insignes apostolos separet. Et in eo quod significabat Petrus, ambo erant: et in eo quod significabat Johannes, ambo futuri erant .... Nec ipsi soli, sed universa hoc facit sancta Ecclesia sponsa Christi, ab istis tentationibus eruenda, in illa felicitate servanda. Quas duas vitas Petrus et Johannes figuraverunt, singuli singulas..... Omnibus igitur sanctis ad Christi corpus inseparabiliter pertinentibus, propter hujus vitæ procellosissimæ gubernaculum, ad liganda et solvenda peccata claves regni cœlorum primus apostolorum

signified, they were to be together.... Nor these alone, but the holy universal Church, the Spouse of Christ, does the same, in being brought out from these temptations, in being saved for this felicity. Which two modes of life Peter and John represented, severally.... ON BEHALF OF ALL THE SAINTS, therefore, who belong inseparably to the body of Christ, in order to the proper direction of this most stormy life, Peter, the first of the apostles, received the keys of the kingdom of heaven for the binding and loosing of sins: AND ON BEHALF OF ALL THE SAME SAINTS, in order to the obtaining that most serene haven of the hidden life, John the evangelist reclined on the breast of Christ. As therefore it is not Peter alone, but the whole Church, which binds and looses sins, neither is it John alone who drinks from the fountain of the Lord's breast the sublime truths which he put forth in his preaching; that in the beginning was the Word, God with God, and the rest concerning the divinity of Christ, and the Trinity and Unity of the divine nature,—truths to be contemplated face to face in his kingdom, and now, until the Lord come, to be beheld in a glass and in mystery,—but the Lord himself diffuses this Gospel to be drank by all his saints, each according to his capacity, throughout the whole world."

Having thus, I trust, exhibited sufficiently the sentiments of the great Augustin on your principal text from St. Matthew, let me next proceed to show how he understood your other favourite passage in the Gospel of

Petrus accepit: eisdemque omnibus sanctis propter vitæ illius secretissimæ quietissimum sinum, super pectus Christi Johannes Evangelista discubuit. Quoniam nec iste solus, sed universa Ecclesia ligat solvitque peccata: nec ille in principio Verbum, Deum apud Deum, et cetera de Christi divinitate, et de totius divinitatis Trinitate atque unitate sublimia, quæ in illo regno facie ad faciem contemplanda, nunc autem donec veniat Dominus, in speculo atque in ænigmate contuenda sunt, quæ prædicando ructaret, de fonte Dominici pectoris solus bibit: sed ipse Dominus ipsum Evangelium pro sua cujusque capacitate omnibus suis bibendum toto terrarum orbe diffusit."

St. John, on which you rest your assertion, that in commanding Peter to feed his sheep, our Lord committed to him and his successors, in the see of Rome, the pastoral care and government of the whole catholic Church under heaven.

In his discourse upon the day held in honour of the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul, we read as follows: viz. [1] "*Feed my sheep*, I commit my sheep to thee. What sheep? Those which I have bought with my blood. I have died for them. Dost thou love me? Die, then, for them. And truly as that servant who was the man of man should give a price for the sheep that were lost, Peter gave his blood for the sheep that were saved. But come, brethren," continues Augustin, "I wish to say something for the present time. That which was committed to Peter, that which he was commanded to do, NOT PETER ONLY, BUT LIKEWISE ALL THE APOSTLES HEARD, HELD, AND KEPT: and chiefly that companion of his martyrdom and of his natal day, the apostle Paul. They heard these things, and transmitted them to us that we might hear them. WE FEED THEREFORE, and are fed with you. May God give us strength in such wise to love you, that we also may be enabled to die for you, either in fact, or in affection." Here you have the same sentiment which Augustin presented to us on the subject of the keys. What was said to Peter was said to all, and received

[1] S. Augustin. Sermo in Natali Apostolorum Petri et Pauli.

Ib. tom. v. p. 836. E. "*Pasce oves meas*, commendo tibi oves meas. Quas oves? Quas emi sanguine meo. Mortuus sum pro eis. Amas me? Morere pro eis. Et quidem servus ille hominis homo pecuniam redderet pro consumptis ovibus: Petrus sanguinem reddidit pro ovibus conservatis. § 5. Eia, Fratres, aliquid pro tempore volo dicere. Quod Petro commendatum est, quod Petro mandatum est, non Petrus solus, sed etiam alii Apostoli audierunt, tenuerunt, servaverunt, maximeque ipse consors sanguinis et diei apostolus Paulus. Audierunt ista, et ad nos audienda transmiserunt. Pascimus vos, pascimur vobiscum. Det nobis Deus vires sic amandi vos, ut possimus etiam mori pro vobis, aut effectu, aut affectu."

by all. Not one word, brethren, is to be found of your exclusive comment on these portions of Scripture in the matured system of this celebrated teacher: but his testimony, both positive and negative, is directly hostile to your claims.

Let me next beg your attention to Augustin's style of expression, when he speaks of the catholic Church. And here I shall cite the epistle of the Tertensian council, to which his name is appended, and which of course must be received as not only his, but also the declaration of the other bishops united with him. Referring to the Donatists, this document proceeds as follows: [1] "They have made their confession against the catholic Church, which is diffused throughout the whole world, and have no more that they can say; because they are borne down by the divine testimonies of the holy Scriptures, in which the Church is set forth as beginning at Jerusalem, and is said to have increased through the places in which the apostles preached, and the names of those places are written in the Epistles and in the Acts, and thence it was diffused through the other nations."

Again, saith Augustin, elsewhere, [2] "The Church is the house of God. But this house is not built in one corner of the earth, but through all the earth."

And again: [3] "The body of Christ," saith he, "is

[1] Concilii Tertensis ad Donat. epistola. Augustin. Op. tom. ii. p. 347. "Confessi sunt enim contra ecclesiam Catholicam, quæ toto terrarum orbe diffunditur, nihil se habere quod dicerent: quia divinis sanctarum scripturarum testimoniis oppressi sunt, quibus Ecclesia designatur incipiens ab Jerusalem crevisse per loca in quibus apostoli prædicaverunt, et nomina eorundem locorum in suis epistolis et actis conscripserunt, et inde diffundi per ceteras gentes."

[2] Aug. Op. tom. ii. p. 350. "Ecclesiam eamdem esse domum Dei. Sed hæc domus non orbis terræ uno angulo ædificatur, sed per omnem terram."

[3] Ibid. p. 330. D. "Corpus autem Christi, ecclesia. Firmamenta autem ecclesiæ qui, nisi Apostoli, qui etiam columnæ alibi nuncupantur?"

the Church. But who are the supporters of the Church, unless it be the apostles, who are also called pillars?" We have in these extracts, which might be multiplied to the size of a volume, a true and simple description of the catholic Church, without the slightest allusion to the domination of the Roman see, or the headship of the *vicar of Christ*, which you suppose to be indispensable.

But the freedom of Augustin's mind from any such tenet, will probably appear more plainly, if we advert to some other passages, in which he has occasion to speak of Rome.

Thus he saith, in one place,[1] "For the Lord promised with an oath, to the seed of Abraham, not the Romans, but all nations: through which promise it has already happened, that some nations who are not under the Roman authority, have received the Gospel and been joined to the Church, which increases and bears fruit in the whole world."

Again; we may see how little the other Churches considered themselves bound to follow the example of the supposed "*mother and mistress*" of them all, with regard to rites and ceremonies. For Augustin, writing to a friend who had consulted him on several points of ecclesiastical order, saith:[2] "The question relating to the sabbath day is more easily resolved, since the Roman Church fasts on that day, and also some other Churches, although but few, whether near to her, or at a distance." And, pursuing the subject, he relates the rule which

[1] Ibid. tom. ii. 577. B. "Non enim Romanos, sed omnes gentes Dominus semini Abrahæ, media quoque juratione promisit: ex qua promissione jam factum est, ut nonnullæ gentes, quæ non tenentur ditione Romana, reciperent Evangelium, et adjungerentur Ecclesiæ, quæ fructificat et crescit in universo mundo."

[2] Ibid. tom. ii. p. 59. F. "Et de die quidem sabbati facilior causa est, quia et Romana jejunat Ecclesia, et aliæ nonnullæ etiamsi paucæ sive illi proximæ sive longinquæ."

Ambrose delivered to him at Milan, soon after he was baptized, [1] "When I am here," said Ambrose to his pupil, "I do not fast on the sabbath day: when I am at Rome, I fast; and to whatever Church you come," continued he, "observe its customs, if you do not wish either to make, or to suffer scandal." Adopting the maxim, accordingly, of his former master, Augustin concludes by this general rule. [2] "If you are willing to acquiesce in my advice," saith he, "do not oppose your bishop in this thing, but whatever he does, do you follow without scruple or disputation."

What prelate, brethren, holding your present system, would speak thus of the opinions and practice of the Church of Rome; or leave it, in this manner, in the power of every bishop, either to follow her ritual or to depart from it, precisely as he pleased?

One quotation more, however, must close the testimony of Augustin; for the limits assigned to this portion of my humble labours have been passed already, and I am compelled, however reluctantly, to omit much which I had marked for insertion.

And in presenting to you, brethren, this passage, I pretend not to forestall your judgment; but to my mind, it seems worthy of your most serious consideration. For you well know, that amongst all the arguments urged against the reformation, there is not one more effective in your esteem, nor is there one more practically successful, than that which you derive from the variety of sects into which the dissenters from your Church are divided. And

[1] Ibid. tom. ii. p. 62. A. "Quando hic sum, non jejuno sabbato; quando Romæ sum, jejuno sabbato: et ad quamcumque ecclesiam veneritis, inquit, ejus morem servate, si pati scandalum non vultis aut facere."

[2] Ibid. "Quapropter si consilio meo libenter adquiescis: Episcopo tuo in hac re noli resistere, et quod facit ipse sine ullo scrupulo vel disceptatione sectare."

you point with triumph to your unity—you say that in the age which preceded the reformation, there was but one form of the Christian religion throughout the civilised world—you refer to the injunctions of the Saviour that his followers should be one, and you demonstrate the necessity of all the peculiar rights of the pope, from the apparent impossibility of governing the Church in unity and peace, without a *vicar of Christ*, and a diocese which shall be acknowledged as the *mother and mistress* of all the Churches.

Brethren, we admit that a portion of this argument is true. It is true that before the reformation, there was a great deal of ecclesiastical union, where there is now no union whatever. Not that your statement is to be allowed in its full extent; for the numerous and important Church of Greece—the descendants of the eastern, as yours is of the western branch—the Syrian Churches, besides some other sects whom you call heretics—were known and acknowledged exceptions to the universality of your dominion, even then. But admitting, for the sake of argument, that it was so, and leaving unnoticed the bitter animosities and angry contentions amongst yourselves, which history has recorded, what is there to warrant your inference, that because you were united, therefore your system must be all divine? Most willingly we grant that religious truth, when fully understood, must produce ecclesiastical union: but it would be miserable logic which should undertake to prove, that ecclesiastical union can *only* be produced by religious truth. Union, in itself, is neither good nor evil. To give it character, it is necessary to combine it with a definite object; and then, it is the *object* of union, and not the *fact* of union, which decides our judgment of its value. Hence, while there is nothing so desirable amongst men as union in truth, so, on the other hand, there is nothing so much to

be deprecated, as union in error. I must needs say, therefore, brethren, that this favourite argument of yours, however plausible to the unreflecting, seems to me nothing better than a weak sophism: for you rely on your union, in order to justify your claims, instead of first proving your claims in order to justify your union.

But I pass from the logic of this argument, to a question of fact, which changes the whole aspect of the case before us. It is this: that so far back as the primitive ages, there were divisions, and heresies, and schisms. They appeared even under the apostles' government. They multiplied after their departure; and at the close of the fourth century, Augustin gives us a list of them amounting to EIGHTY-EIGHT, although he professes himself by no means sure that his list included the whole. I subjoin it in the language of the original; [1] and to me it seems, of itself, an incontestable proof, that the primitive Church acknowledged no such judge as your canon law represents the pope to be; for if it had, every teacher of heresy would have been brought before his tribunal; and the people, taught universally to revere the judgment of this oracle of God, could not have been induced to

[1] S. Augustin. Op. tom. viii. p. 3. 1. Simoniani. 2. Menandriani. 3. Saturniniani. 4. Basilidiani. 5. Nicolaitani. 6. Gnostici. 7. Carpocratiani. 8. Cerinthiani. 9. Nazaræi. 10. Ebionæi. 11. Valentiniani. 12. Secundiani. 13. Ptolemæi. 14. Marcitæ. 15. Colorbasii. 16. Heracleonitæ. 17. Ophitæ. 18. Caiani. 19. Sethiani. 20. Archontici. 21. Cerdoniani. 22. Marcionitæ. 23. Appellitæ. 24. Severiani. 25. Tatiani, vel Encratitæ. 26. Cataphryges. 27. Pepuziani, alias Quintilliani. 28. Artotyritæ. 29. Tessarescæ-decatitæ. 30. Alogii. 31. Adamiani. 32. Elcesæi, et Sampsæi. 33. Theodotiani. 34. Melchisedeciani. 35. Bardesanistæ. 36. Noëtiani. 37. Valesii. 38. Cathari, sive Novatiani. 39. Angelici. 40. Apostolici. 41. Sabelliani, sive Patripassiani. 42. Origeniani. 43. Alii Origeniani. 44. Pauliani. 45. Photiniani. 46. Manichæi. 47. Hieracitæ. 48. Meletiani. 49. Ariani. 50. Vadiani, sive Anthropomorphitæ. 51. Semiariani. 52. Macedoniani. 53. Aëriani. 54. Aëtiani, qui et Eu-

form a sect around a justly condemned proclaimer of error. Apply, then, brethren, your own argument to this period of the Church, and see to what conclusion it will lead you. The pope is the centre of unity, you say: the rejection of his authority is the great source of division. But in the time of Augustin there was more division than there is now; and therefore, according to your own reasoning, there could not then have been a general acknowledgment of the pope's authority. One vast difference however, is to be observed between the early and the later periods of the Church: viz. that now, you who term yourselves the true catholics, always place our rejection of Roman supremacy in the foreground of our errors; and insist on our return to the papal jurisdiction with all your powers: whereas, amongst the eighty eight heresies of the primitive ages, and amongst all the arguments of the fathers against them, NOT ONE SENTENCE CAN BE FOUND UPBRAIDING THEIR ADHERENTS WITH A DEPARTURE FROM THE POPE, OR THE CHURCH OF ROME. What you may think of this difference, brethren, I know not: but in my judgment it seems enough, of itself, to determine the controversy.

nomiani. 55. Apollinaristæ. 56. Antidicomaritæ. 57. Massaliani, sive Eudritæ. 58. Metangismonitæ. 59. Seleuciani, vel Hermiani. 60. Proclianitæ. 61. Patriciani. 62. Ascitæ. 63. Passalorynchitæ. 64. Aquarii. 65. Coluthiani. 66. Floriniani. 67. De mundi statu dissentientes. 68. Nudis pedibus ambulantes. 69. Donatistæ, sive Donatiani. 70. Priscillianistæ. 71. Cum hominibus non manducantes. 72. Rhetoriani. 73. Christi divinitatem passibilem dicentes. 74. Triformem Deum putantes. 75. Aquam Deo cœternam dicentes. 76. Imaginem Dei non esse animam dicentes. 77. Innumerabiles mundos opinantes. 78. Animas converti in dæmones et in quæcumque animalia existimantes. 79. Liberationem omnium apud inferos factam Christi descensione credentes. 80. Christi de Patre nativitati initium temporis dantes. 81. Luciferiani. 82. Jovinianistæ. 83. Arabici. 84. Helvidiani. 85. Paterniani, sive Venustiani. 86. Tertullianistæ. 87. Abeloitæ. 88. Pelagiani, qui et Cœlestiani.

CHAPTER XXIX.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

THE evidence of the eloquent Chrysostom, who may be set down at A.D. 398, next claims our notice, and would justify a far larger space than our limits will allow. A few brief extracts must suffice us.

In his celebrated work on the episcopal office, we read as follows: [1] "For he," namely Christ, "conversing with the prince of the apostles, saith, *Peter, lovest thou me?* and Peter answering affirmatively, he adds: If thou lovest me, feed my sheep. The master interrogates the scholar, whether he is loved by him; not that he might be informed (for how should he seek information to whom the hearts of all men are open) but in order that he might

[1] St. Jo. Chrysost. de Sacerdotio, lib. 2. Op. om. Latine, tom. v. p. 418. "Hic enim cum apostolorum principe verba faciens: Petre, amas me? inquit, atque illo id confitente, adjungit: Si amas me, pasce oves meas. Interrogat discipulum magister, num ab eo ametur: non quo id ipse edoceatur: (qui enim id edoceri studeat is, cui uni mortalium omnium corda pervia sunt,) verum ut nos doceat, quantæ sibi curæ sit gregis hujus præfectura . . . . . Propterea enim quum respondisset discipulus: Tu scis, Domine, quod amem te, testemque citasset amoris hujus ipsummet qui amaretur, haud se hic continuit servator Jesus, sed et amoris quoque indicium adjunxit. Neque enim tum volebat testatum esse, quantum a Petro amaretur: siquidem id multis nobis argumentis constabat: verum hoc ille tum agebat, ut et Petrum et cæteros nos edoceret, quanta benevolentia ac caritate ergo suam ipse ecclesiam afficeretur: ut hac ratione et nos quoque ejusdem ecclesiæ studium curamque toto animo susciperemus.

teach us of what importance he esteemed the oversight of this flock."

"On which account," continues Chrysostom, "when the disciple had answered: Thou knowest, Lord, that I love thee, and had even cited himself to witness it, the Saviour Jesus did not cease, but added another injunction, as an index of love. Nor did he desire in this merely to show how much he was loved by Peter, since this appeared by many other proofs; but he acted thus, *in order to teach Peter and all of us* with how much love and benevolence he was affected towards his Church: *so that we also might be influenced by this motive, to take upon us the care and charge of the same Church*, with our whole heart. . . . . For why did he shed his blood? Certainly that he might purchase to himself this flock, of which he then *committed the care to Peter, and to Peter's successors.*"

Chrysostom here calls Peter the *prince* of the apostles, and the office of the apostolate he frequently elsewhere calls by the term of *principality;* but it is observable that his interpretation of the whole passage is altogether different from that which your present system demands. For instead of considering that our Redeemer designed to commit the whole Church, apostles and all, to the pastoral government of Peter, he evidently adopts the same view with the other fathers, viz. that what was addressed to Peter was intended for all. You also perceive, that instead of limiting the successors of Peter to the diocese of Rome, he pursues the enlarged construction, that all bishops are his successors. You remember brethren, the observation made on the Latin word translated *prince*, in the chapter upon the evidence of Hilary. To which I have only to add, that there is nothing in it, as

. . . . . Quanam item de causa idem ille sanguinem effudit suum? certe ut pecudes eas acquireret, quarum curam tum Petro, tum Petri successoribus committebat."

used by Chrysostom, which necessarily implies authority over the other apostles.

Again, I find Chrysostom referring to your other proof-text in the following manner. [1] "To those who cultivate the earth," saith he, "and are conversant with it, it is granted that they may dispense the things of heaven: to them is given a power which the Almighty God chose not to commit either to angels or archangels; since it was not said to these: Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven. Terrestrial princes, truly, have the power of the chain, but only with respect to the body. But this chain of the priests, of which I speak, concerns also the soul, and extends even to the heavens." . . . . And again, [2] "Whose sins ye shall retain, saith Christ, they are retained. What power can be greater? The Father gave all power to the Son, but I behold this same power delivered by God the Son to them," (*i.e.* the priesthood.)

Here, brethren, you perceive the power of the keys considered, not as being conferred on Peter and his successors in the see of Rome, according to your doctrine, but as granted to the apostolic priesthood collectively; according to the enlarged construction so frequently ex-

[1] Lib. iii. p. 429. B. "Etenim qui terram incolunt atque in ea versantur, iis commissum est ut ea quæ in cœlis sunt, dispensent; iis datum est ut potestatem habeant, quam Deus optimus neque angelis neque archangelis datam esse voluit: neque enim ad illos dictum est, Quæcumque alligaveris in terra, erunt alligata et in cœlo; et quæcumque solveris in terra, erunt soluta et in cœlo. Habent quidem et terrestres principes vinculi potestâtem, verum corporum solum. Id autem quod dico sacerdotum vinculum, ipsam etiam animam contingit, atque ad cœlos usque pervadit. . . . ."

[2] . . . . "Quorumcunque, ait, peccata retinueritis, retenta sunt. Quænam, obsecro, potestas hac una major esse queat? Pater omnifariam Filio potestatem dedit: cæterum video ipsam eandem omnifariam potestatem a Deo Filio illis traditam."

hibited to us by all the other witnesses, and in the previous passage, by Chrysostom himself.

Let me next show you, that the famous text concerning the foundation of the Church, was interpreted by our present witness precisely as it was by those who preceded him. For in his comment on the 26th chapter of Matthew, Chrysostom saith that Christ [1] "founded and fortified the Church *upon his confession*," (*i.e.* Peter's) "so that no danger, nor even death itself could overcome it."

Again, commenting on the very words of the Saviour, [2] "And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church," Chrysostom saith, "that is, UPON THE FAITH OF HIS CONFESSION." Nothing can be more express and definite.

In common with almost all the fathers, Chrysostom seems to take particular pleasure in the character of St. Paul. [3] "There is no one who loved Christ more vehemently than Paul," saith he, "and *none who was a greater favourite* with God; nevertheless, after so many privileges conferred on him by the Almighty, he fears and trembles, on account of those who were the subjects of *this principality*." The object of this venerable father's argument is to show the awful responsibility of the episcopal office, and therefore he recurs to St. Paul, as to

[1] Ibid. In cap. xxvi. Math. Homil. 83. comment. tom. i. p. 866. "Nam qui super confessionem ejus Ecclesiam ita fundavit atque munivit, ut nullum periculum, neque mors ipsa posset eam superare."

[2] Ibid. Homil. 55. in cap. xxvi. Math. p. 591. "*Et ego dico tibi, Quia tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam:* id est, *super fidem confessionis.*" The original Greek is τῇ πίστει τῆς ὁμολογίας, *upon the faith of his confession.* Which your translator has expressed with great carelessness, to say the least, in these words: fidem atque confessionem.

[3] Ibid. p. 430. D. "Christum nemo est qui Paulo vehementius dilexerit, nemo qui apud Deum gratiosior quam Paulus fuerit: tamen post tot privilegia a Deo accepta veretur adhuc ac tremuit, principatus istius subditorumque suorum gratia."

him who was not a whit behind the very chief of the apostles, calling his office a principality. Take these few specimens, brethren, as a fair sample of the testimony of Chrysostom, and you will have no difficulty in reckoning him among the rest, as plainly opposed to that interpretation of Scripture by which you sustain your exclusive claims.

CHAPTER XXX.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

As your canon law gives a special place to the *blessed Isidore* (A.D. 412), I proceed to notice a few passages in his epistles bearing on the points in question, and taken, as in other instances, from your Latin version. [1] "It was not," saith this witness, "because Christ was ignorant of the various opinions which men had formed concerning him that he demanded of his disciples, *Whom do men say that I am?* for he penetrates the very heart. But it was in order that he might deliver to all men, by this means, *a sure confession, which Peter, inspired by Him, laid down as a basis and foundation, whereupon the Lord built his Church.*"

You perceive in this passage, brethren, a distinct interpretation of your favourite text, in direct hostility to your present argument. And the other passage, on which you depend for the Scriptural proof that our Lord committed the whole Church to the care of Peter, is commented on by Isidore in the following words, equally inapplicable to your doctrine: viz.

[1] S. Isidori Pelusiotæ de interpret. divin. Scrip. Epistol. lib. i. ep. 235. "Non ea de causa Christus, qui pectus ipsum penetrat, ex discipulis suis percontabatur: Quem me dicunt homines esse? quod variam hominum de se opinionem ignoraret, sed ut hac ratione certam omnibus confessionem traderet, quam ab eo inspiratus Petrus, tamquam basim ac fundamentum jecit, super quod Dominus Ecclesiam suam extruxit."

[1] "The threefold interrogation of the Lord addressed to Peter, concerning love," saith our witness, "is not to be attributed to the ignorance of the Redeemer (lest any should be deceived) but the good physician, *by this triple assent, expelled the triple denial.*"

The same explanation occurs amongst the fathers so frequently, that there is hardly any text on which their comments appear with greater unanimity.

From the writings of Prosper of Aquitain, (A.D. 434) whom your canon styles a most religious man, I shall only trouble you with two excellent passages on the Church, where nothing is intimated like your system.

[2] "The sons of the servants of God," saith he, "are the sons of the just, the sons of the patriarchs, the prophets, the apostles and martyrs; the sons, in fine, of the whole Church which is the body of Christ, the mother of all the fathers, and of all the sons." And again,

[3] "The whole Church with her head, which is Christ, is one man, whose proper office is, through all time, to bless God, and to encourage herself in his praise, whom she loves with her whole strength. But her internal qualities are the reason of intelligence, the hope of faith, the humility of fear, the patience of love; and if there

[1] Ib. lib. i. Ep. 103. "Triplex Domini ad Petrum de charitate interrogatio, a Domini ignoratione proficisci minime existimanda est; (ne ita quidam decipiantur) verum triplicem negationem triplici assensione bonus medicus depulit."

[2] S. Prosperi Aquitan. Expos. in Psal. ci. Ed. Paris. 1711. p. 378. "Filii servorum Dei, sunt filii justorum, filii patriarcharum, prophetarum, Apostolorum et martyrum: filii postremo totius Ecclesiæ quæ corpus est Christi, et quæ mater est omnium patrum omniumque filiorum."

[3] Ib. in Psal. cii. "Tota Ecclesia cum suo capite, quod est Christus, unus est homo, cujus proprium officium est in omne tempore benedicere Dominum, seque in laudem ejus, quem ex tota virtute sua diligit, cohortari. *Interiora* autem ejus sunt ratio intelligentiæ, spes fidei, humilitas timoris, fortitudo caritatis: et si quæ sunt aliæ affectiones, quibus mens in admirationem sui auctoris erigitur."

be any other affections, by which the mind may be lifted up in admiration of its Creator."

On the subject of Peter's authority over the other apostles, or the derived supremacy of the Church of Rome, I find nothing in the works of Prosper; so that his testimony yields no support to your system.

But the name of Vincent of Lirens stands high in your esteem, brethren, on account of his admirable book in favour of apostolical tradition. Let me next quote from this shrewd and powerful writer, a part of his celebrated argument, and we shall then occupy a little space in marking its application.

[1] "If I or any other, desire to detect the frauds of heretics which are rising up around us," saith Vincent, "and to avoid their snares, and to continue sound and whole in a sound faith, he ought to fortify his faith, by the help of God, in a twofold manner; first, by the authority of the divine law, and next, by the tradition of the catholic Church. But here, perhaps, some one may say: Since the canon of the Scriptures is perfect, and suffices to itself by teaching, on all subjects, enough, and to spare, what need have we to join with it the authority of ecclesiastical judgment? I answer: Because all men do not receive the sacred Scripture in the same sense, by reason of its sublimity; but its declarations are variously interpreted by this reader and by that; so that there are

[1] Vincentii Lirinensis Commonitorium, [Salv. et Vincent. Op. ex cura Stephani Baluzii, ed. tertia, Paris. A.D. 1684.] p. 317.

"Sive ego sive quis alius vellet exsurgentium hæreticorum fraudes deprehendere laqueosque vitare, et in fide sana sanus atque integer permanere, duplici modo munire fidem suam, Domino adjuvante, deberet; primum scilicet, divinæ legis auctoritate, tum deinde Ecclesiæ catholicæ traditione. Hic forsitan requirat aliquis: Cum sit perfectus scripturarum canon, sibique ad omnia satis superque sufficiat, quid opus est ut ei ecclesiasticæ intelligentiæ jungatur auctoritas? Quia videlicet scripturam sacram pro ipsa sua altitudine non uno eodemque sensu universi accipiunt,

almost as many different opinions as there are men to form them. Thus, Novatian expounded the Scriptures in one way, Sabellius in another, Donatus in another; Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, had each his several interpretations; Photinus, Apollinaris, Priscillian, Jovinian, Pelagius, Celestius, and finally, Nestorius, all construed the same Scriptures in their several ways. And therefore it is altogether necessary, on account of the many and various distortions of error, that the line of prophetic and apostolical interpretation should be directed, according to the rule of ecclesiastical and catholic construction. *And in the catholic Church herself*, likewise, care is above all things to be taken, that we hold that which has been believed *everywhere*, *always*, *and by all*. For this is truly and properly catholic, since the very force and reason of the word declares, that it comprehends all things universally. And this we shall attain, if we follow *universality*, *antiquity*, and *consent*. And we may follow universality in this manner, if we confess that faith only to be true, which the Church throughout the whole earth confesses: and we shall follow antiquity, if we in nowise recede from those interpretations which our holy ancestors and fathers manifestly adopted: and in like manner we shall main-

sed ejusdem eloquia aliter atque aliter alius atque alius interpretatur; ut pene quot homines sunt, tot illinc sententiæ erui posse videantur. Aliter namque illam Novatianus, aliter Sabellius, aliter Donatus exponit, aliter Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius; aliter Photinus, Apollinaris, Priscillianus; aliter Jovinianus, Pelagius, Cælestius; aliter postremo Nestorius. Atque idcirco multum necesse est, propter tantos tam varii erroris affractus, ut propheticæ et apostolicæ interpretationis linea secundum ecclesiastici et Catholici sensus normam dirigatur. In ipsa item Catholica Ecclesia magnopere curandum est ut id teneamus quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est. Hoc est etenim vere proprieque catholicum. Quod ipsa vis nominis ratioque declarat, quæ omnia fere universaliter comprehendit. Sed hoc ita demum fiet si sequamur universalitatem, antiquitatem, consensionem. Sequemur autem universitatem hoc modo, si hanc unam fidem veram esse fateamur quam tota per orbem

tain consent also, if in this antiquity we embrace the opinions and definitions of all, or at least nearly all the bishops and teachers."

This, brethren, I hold to be sound doctrine, admirably expressed. And I beseech you to apply it to the subject before us. Your present faith makes the supremacy of the pope a part of the creed itself, but we have found no such dogma in the system of the primitive fathers. Your present faith explains the Scriptures in direct opposition to the interpretations which I have cited from the ancient authorities: and the opinions and definitions of all the witnesses we have examined concerning the catholic Church, leave totally unnoticed your supposed essential government of the universal bishop. Hence, by the rule of Vincent, your creed should be reduced to its ancient simplicity, and your interpretations of Scripture should be brought back to the primitive standard.

But this is not the only point of view in which the passage quoted from Vincent should impress the mind of a discerning reader. For your canon law expressly ascribes to the pope, BY DIVINE RIGHT, the office of final judge in all ecclesiastical causes, *especially in those which concern faith.* How is it that Vincent overlooked this divinely constituted tribunal—this living oracle of judgment—when he laid down his famous rule for the faith of the catholic Church? Why should he send men to the fathers, to search for his three ingredients of universality, antiquity, and consent, when a course so much more short and easy lay before him? By what singular stupidity should he have omitted to tell the Church, that

terrarum confitetur Ecclesia; antiquitatem vero ita, si ab his sensibus nullatenus recedamus quos sanctos majores ac patres nostros celebrasse manifestum est: consensionem quoque itidem, si in ipsa vetustate omnium vel certe pene omnium sacerdotum pariter et magistrorum definitiones sententiasque sectemur."

the only thing required to avoid heresy was to abide by the decisions of the vicar of Christ: whom God had appointed, like the Urim and Thummim of ancient Israel, to resolve every doubt, and settle every controversy?

Brethren, is it possible that you can avoid seeing the indirect but invincible objection here furnished, to your present claims? Or can it remain a question, with a candid and a conscientious mind, that the rule of Vincent, connected with the testimony of the fathers, would at once bring our dispute to a safe and plain conclusion? "IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH HERSELF," saith he, "care is above all things to be taken that WE HOLD THAT WHICH HAS BEEN BELIEVED EVERYWHERE, ALWAYS, AND BY ALL. FOR THIS IS TRULY AND PROPERLY CATHOLIC." Judged by this standard, your doctrine may be *Roman* now, but it could not have been Roman at the beginning. God grant that the time may not be far distant, when that primitive CATHOLIC faith which was *once* ROMAN, may be Roman again.

CHAPTER XXXI.

Brethren in Christ,

Having set before you the testimony of those witnesses to whom you yourselves appeal, let me ask your attention to a brief recital of the catalogue.

We commenced, as you will recollect, with the Holy Scriptures. Then we examined the apostolic canons, the apostolic constitutions, and the epistle of Clement, the bishop of Rome, which brought us to the close of the first century. Irenæus and Tertullian gave us the evidence of the second century. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Cyprian, Firmilian and Lactantius, carried us onward to the close of the third century. And, multiplying as we advanced, Eusebius of Cesarea, the emperor Constantine, the council of Nice, Athanasius, the emperor Constantius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Hilary of Poictiers, Basil of Cappadocia, Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustin and Chrysostom, brought us through the fourth century. Beyond this we progressed with Isidore of Pelusium, Prosper of Aquitain, and Vincent of Lirens, which leaves us about the middle of the fifth century; and at this point we have ceased from a task, laborious to the writer, and, I fear, wearisome to the reader; but entitled, notwithstanding, to serious consideration from those who love the truth, and value the venerable remains of Christian antiquity.

And here, brethren, permit me to remind you, that I have not questioned the fidelity with which the writings of the fathers have been handed down to us, except in those instances where your own authors have compelled me. Nevertheless, I owe it to truth to state my conviction, that the expurgations which your scholars have made of these ancient writings have left them, still, far from immaculate; although the labours of your critics are highly creditable to their learning and candour. I shall not trouble you with a statement of my reasons for this conviction: but shall sustain its correctness by quoting the opinions of two among your most able men.

The translator of Athanasius saith, [1] "As in the most fruitful fields many weeds grow up with the best grain, so, to every ancient author of the highest note many false and spurious books are attributed: but to none more than to Athanasius. Moreover these writers, since they are the apes of Athanasius, endeavour to present the same arguments concerning the Trinity, but with no skill, genius, or erudition: indeed they take the most mysterious subjects, and with a wonderful unskilfulness, involve them more and more, until you would think yourself to be not merely in a labyrinth, from which at least the proper clue might extricate you, but rather in a Gordian knot; or else, there being no appearance of

[1] In S. Athan. Op. Epistola Nuncupatoria. "Ut enim fertilissimis agris multa zizania una cum optimis frugibus nascuntur, ita optimo cuique autori plurimi falsi et nothi libri adscribuntur: nulli autem plures, quam Athanasio. Illi porro, qui simiæ sunt Athanasii, eadem argumenta de Trinitate tractare conantur, sed nulla cum mente, ingenio aut eruditione: iidemque res implicatissimas mira infelicitate magis ac magis implicant, ut non in labyrintho, ubi saltem filio exitus inveniri poterat, sed in nodo Gordio te hærere putes: adeo illic nec caput nec cauda apparet, arbitrerisque te in antiquo quasi chao volutari. In hos libros adulterinos quum incidisset Desiderius Erasmus, et nihil melioris venæ expectaret, semel deposito onere fessus, nauseabundusque, exclamavit, ἄλις δρυὸς, nolens amplius glandes gustare."

either head or tail, you might fancy yourself rolling about in the primæval chaos. When Desiderius Erasmus happened upon these adulterated books, and expected nothing of a better quality, disgusted and wearied he threw down his load at once, exclaiming: *Plenty of oak*: being unwilling any longer *to fare on acorns.*"

To this frank and amusing acknowledgment, I shall only add the graver confession of your distinguished Quesnel[1]. "The writings of the holy fathers," saith he, "by which, as by another channel, the truth is delivered through revolving ages, from Christ the Head, even to us, are not yet sufficiently purged from the filth of errors and interpolations, not yet fully restored to their purity; although more than one hundred and fifty years have already elapsed since the enterprize was commenced with no small study by men of vast learning, in order that the whole of the sacred fathers might be, as it were, brought to life again for our benefit."

You perceive, therefore, brethren, that there is abundant reason for a portion of skepticism concerning the fidelity with which these early records have been transmitted; since they stand impeached of corruption, even by yourselves. But I only advert to the fact for the purpose of shewing its proper bearing on the proofs I have exhibited; for it is easy to see, that if I have been able to place before you such a body of evidence against your present system, from books which your predecessors have thus confessedly interpolated, to suit the doctrine of their

[1] Ad S. Leonis Mag. op. præfatio. "At SS. Patrum scripta, per quæ velut per alterum alveum veritas a Christo capite ad nos usque volventibus seculis traducitur, nondum ab erratorum et interpolationum fæce satis purgata sunt, nondum suæ puritati plene reddita: tametsi jam a centum quinquaginta et amplius annis hoc moliri cœperint haud mediocribus vigiliis viri impense docti, ut nobis sancti Patres, toti quasi renascerentur."

day, we should doubtless have made out a far stronger case, if the testimony of those primitive writers had remained in its original purity, and if the multitude of other authors which the Church of Rome did not approve, had been transmitted to us along with them.

CHAPTER XXXII.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

I CONCEIVE it proved by superabundant testimony, that the primitive Church of Rome professed to hold no authoritative supremacy over the other Churches, and that she interpreted the language of Christ to Peter, in precise accordance with the general voice of the fathers, as conveying no official grant of supreme power or domination. It was stated, however, as you probably recollect, in connexion with our remarks upon the testimony of Irenæus, that a *secular primacy of influence* must have belonged to her, on account of the vast superiority of her location; and that this was the root from which her claims to spiritual supremacy grew into their subsequent magnitude. I doubt not, indeed, that the bishops of Rome conceived the idea of establishing this supremacy, at a very early day. Neither do I question their sincerity in thinking that the peace and prosperity of the Church would thereby be greatly promoted. The policy of earthly wisdom could find no objection to the theory of such a system. According to human judgment, it promised a fair and useful result. But these good men forgot that religion was not committed to the wisdom of this world. They forgot that the Almighty had predicted

ruin and not success, as the final issue of every attempt to unite God and Mammon. They lost sight of the distinguishing glory of the Gospel, which chose the weak things of the world to confound the things that were mighty; and in being wise above what was written, and in seeking that union from policy which could alone be given by the Spirit of holiness and truth, they did indeed lay the foundation of a wonderful fabric of ecclesiastical power, and it became, in the progress of a few centuries, a tower like that of Babel, whose summit was designed to reach the heavens: but the structure was human, not divine, and therefore it was subject to the usual fate of earthly mutation. It would be as unkind as it is useless to press the comparison between the literal Babel and the mystic Babylon. I prefer leaving that species of argument to other hands.

It may be asked, however, how the doctrine of papal supremacy could have been admitted by the Church, if it were not founded upon the authority of the Redeemer? To this I reply, that the rank and influence of the Roman see, having given it a great and increasing preponderance in the councils of the Church, the canons of these councils by degrees confirmed its dignity. Thus the right of receiving appeals was conferred upon it first by the council of Sardica, some years subsequent to the council of Nice. The acknowledgment that it was the first of all the Churches, was made still later by the council of Constantinople. The language of the council of Carthage testified to the growth of Roman influence, and that of the council of Chalcedon bore witness to its strength, while it sanctioned, in favour of Constantinople, the claims of a rival, which the fathers of that council called "A NEW ROME." Besides these recognitions of Roman preponderance, the emperors, particularly Valentinian in the west, and Marcian in the east, had established the power of

appeals *by law*, and these causes combined, even so early as the time of pope Leo, in the middle of the fifth century, gave a considerable foothold to your doctrine. It is altogether beside my design, however, in this humble work, to assume the office of historian, and therefore I refer you to the pages of your own celebrated annalist, the candid, the learned, and the elaborate Fleury; who, although, of course, a champion for his Church, yet confesses and deplores the change which led her so far from the truth of her primitive system.

[1] "The pure days of the Church," saith this author, speaking of the close of the sixth century, "are passed away. Rome, idolatrous, stained with so many crimes, and drunk with the blood of so many martyrs, was doomed to be punished, and divine vengeance was to be signalised upon her, in the face of all the nations." Proceeding to apply the predictions of the Apocalypse to heathen Rome, your historian continues: "The execution of the sentence followed in due season. Rome ceased to be the capital of the empire, after Constantine had transferred his seat to Byzantium: and from the time that the empire was divided, the emperors of the west resided at Ravenna, at Milan, and everywhere rather than at Rome. Thus she lost, by degrees, her splendour, her riches, her people. . . . Meanwhile she was taken and pillaged several times by the barbarians, who ravaged and tore in pieces all the western empire." . . .

[1] Histoire Ecclésiastique par M. Fleury, ed. de 1758. tom. xiii. Discours sur l' Histoire Ecclésiastique, depuis l'an 600 jusqu'à l'an 1100.

"Les beaux jours de l'église sont passés.

"Rome idolâtre, souillée de tant de crimes et enyvrée du sang de tant de martyrs, devoit être punie, et la vengeance divine devoit éclater sur elle, à la face de toutes les nations. . . . . L'exécution suivit en son tems. Rome cessa d'être la capitale de l'empire, depuis que Constantin en eut transféré le siége à Bizance : et depuis que l'empire fut partagé, les empereurs d'Occident résidèrent à Ravenne, à Milan, et partout ailleurs qu'

"These barbarians, it is true, became converted; some sooner; some later, ... but in becoming Christians, they did not abandon altogether their former character, they continued, for the most part, light, fickle, violent, and acted upon more by passion than by reason. They retained also their contempt for literature and the arts, and only occupied themselves with hunting and with war. Hence arose ignorance, even among the Romans who were their subjects. For the character of the dominant nation always prevails, and learning languishes, when honour and interest no longer sustain it."

"In the following ages, the most enlightened men, such as Bede, Alcuin, Hincmar, Gerbert, were affected by the misfortune of their times; desiring to attain all the sciences, they did not become thoroughly acquainted with any, and knew nothing with exactness or method. But what they most needed was that critical learning, which would have enabled them to distinguish false writings from true. For there were, at this period, a multitude of pieces, forged under illustrious names; and this not only by the heretics, but by the catholics, and even with good

à Rome. Ainsi elle perdit peu à peu son éclat, ses richesses, son peuple. . . . . Cependant elle fut prise et pillée plusieurs fois par les barbares, qui ravagèrent et mirent en pièces tout l'empire d'Occident. . . . . .

Ces barbares, il est vrai, se convertirent; les uns plutôt, les autres plus tard; . . . . . mais les barbares, en devenant Chrétiens, ne quittèrent pas entièrement leurs anciennes mœurs; ils demeurèrent la plupart legers, changeans, emportés, agissant plus par passion que par raison. . . . . Ces peuples continuoient dans leur mépris pour les lettres et pour les arts, ne s'occupant que de la chasse et de la guerre. De-là vint l'ignorance, même chez les Romains leurs sujets. Car les mœurs de la nation dominante prévalent toujours, et les études languissent, si l'honneur et l'intérêt ne les soutiennent." . . . .

"Dans les siècles suivans, les hommes les plus éclairés, comme Bede, Alcuin, Hincmar, Gerbert, se sentoient du malheur des tems: voulant embrasser toutes les sciences, ils n'en approfondissoient aucune, et ne sçavoient rien exactement. Ce qui leur manquoit le plus étoit la critique

intentions. Thus Virgil of Thaspis avows that he borrowed the name of St. Athanasius, in order to attract the attention of the Vandal Arians. In like manner, whenever they had not the acts of a martyr to read on the day of his festival, they composed the most probable or the most marvellous that they could: and thereby thought to promote the piety of the people. These false legends were chiefly fabricated on the occasion of the removal of relics, so frequent in the ninth century."

"They also framed title deeds, whether to supply the place of genuine records which they had lost, or altogether fictions: as the famous donation of Constantine" (granting Rome to the pope) "of which there was no doubt in France during the ninth century. But of all these forgeries, the most pernicious were the decretals attributed to the popes of the first four centuries, which inflicted an incurable wound on the discipline of the Church, by the new maxims which they introduced, for the judgments of bishops, and the authority of the pope."

"Another effect of this ignorance, was to render men

pour distinguer les pièces fausses des véritables. Car il y avoit dès-lors quantité d'écrits fabriqués sous des noms illustres, non seulement par des hérétiques, mais par des catholiques, et même à bonne intention. J'ai marqué que Virgile de Thaspe avoue lui-même avoir emprunté le nom de Saint Athanase, pour se faire écouter des Vandales Ariens. Ainsi quand on n'avoit pas les actes d'un martyr pour lire au jour de sa fête, on en composoit les plus vraisemblables ou les plus merveilleux que l'on pouvoit: et par là l'on croyoit entretenir la piété des peuples. Ces fausses légendes furent principalement fabriquées à l'occasion des translations de reliques, si fréquentes dans le neuvième siècle."

"On faisoit aussi des titres, soit à la place des véritables que l'on avoit perdus, soit absolument supposés: comme la fameuse donation de Constantin, dont on ne doutoit pas en France au neuvième siècle. Mais de toutes ces pièces fausses les plus pernicieuses furent les décrétales attribuées aux papes des quatre premiers siècles, qui ont fait une playe irréparable à la discipline de l'église, par les maximes nouvelles qu'elles ont introduites touchant les jugemens des évêques et l'autorité du pape. . . . [p. 7.] "Un

credulous and superstitious, for want of having sure principles of belief, and an exact knowledge of the duties of religion."

"And a further consequence of the domination of the barbarians, was that the bishops and the clergy became hunters and warriors like the laity. The bishops had their vassals to serve at their order for the fiefs (or estates) which they held; and when the bishop himself was commanded by the king, he was obliged to march at the head of his troops. Charlemagne finding this right established, wished to relax it at the request of his people; and he dispensed with the personal service of the bishops, provided they sent their vassals. But this regulation was badly observed, and we find that afterwards, as well as before, bishops armed themselves, and fought, and were taken and killed in war."

"But after the bishops found themselves lords, and admitted on the part of the government of states, they supposed that they possessed, as bishops, what they only possessed as lords; and pretended to judge kings, not only in the tribunal of penitence, but in their councils.

"Un autre effet de l'ignorance est de rendre les hommes crédules et superstitieux, faute d'avoir des principes certains de créance et une connoissance exacte des devoirs de la religion."

"Un autre effet de la domination des barbares, c'est que les évêques et les clercs devinrent chasseurs et guerriers comme les läiques."

"Les évêques avoient leurs vassaux obligés à servir à leur ordre pour les fiefs qu'ils tenoient d'eux; et quand l'évêque lui-même étoit mandé par le roi, il devoit marcher à la tête de ses troupes. Charlemagne trouvant ce droit établi, voulut bien s'en relâcher à la priere de son peuple; et il dispensa les évêques de servir en personne, pourvû qu'ils envoyassent leurs vassaux. Mais ce réglement fut mal observé, et nous voyons après comme devant, les évêques armés, combattans, pris et tués à la guerre."

"Mais depuis que les évêques se virent seigneurs et admis en part du governement des états, ils crurent avoir, comme évêques, ce qu'ils n'avoient que comme seigneurs: ils prétendirent juger les rois non-seulement dans le tribunal de la pénitence, mais dans les conciles. . . . La

The coronation ceremonial introduced since the middle of the eighth century, served them for a pretext: the bishop, in placing the crown upon the king, seemed to confer the kingdom on the part of God."

" The popes, believing, with reason, that they had as much and even more authority than the bishops, undertook very soon to regulate the disputes of sovereigns, not by the way of mediation and intercession only, but by authority: which was, in effect, to dispose of crowns."

The condition of the papal court, under this system, is described by your candid historian upon the highest testimony, that of the famous Bernard, in the following terms: viz.

" St. Bernard represents to us," saith Fleury, " the consistory of the cardinals, as a parliament, or a sovereign tribunal, occupied in judging causes from morning till night: and the pope who presides there, is so overwhelmed with affairs, that he hardly has time to breathe. The court of Rome is full of advocates, of solicitors, of passionate pleaders, insincere, interested, seeking only to take each other by surprise, and each trying to enrich himself at the expense of his neighbour."

cérémonie du sacre, introduite depuis le milieu du huitième siècle, servit encore de prétexte: les évêques, en imposant la couronne, sembloient donner le royaume de la part de Dieu." p. 22.

" Les papes croyant, avec raison, avoir autant et même plus d'autorité que les évêques, entreprirent bientôt de régler les différens entre les souverains: non par voie du médiation et d'intercession seulement, mais par autorité: ce qui en effet étoit disposer des couronnes."

Ib. tom. 16. Discours 14. p. xiv.

" Saint Bernard nous représente le consistoire des cardinaux comme un parlement ou un tribunal souverain, occupé à juger des procès depuis le matin jusqu' au soir, et le pape qui y presidoit tellement accablé d'affaires, qu' à peine avoit-il un moment pour respirer. La cour de Rome pleine d'avocats, de solliciteurs, de plaideurs passionnés, artificieux, interessés, ne cherchant qu'à se surprendre l'un l'autre et s'enrichir aux depens d'autrui."

"I know that this crowd of prelates and other strangers whom various interests attracted to Rome, brought great wealth to the city, and that her people fattened at the cost of all others; but I am ashamed to mention such an advantage when we are treating of religion. For, was the pope established at Rome in order to enrich, or in order to sanctify it?"

"The decretal of Gratian completed the work of confirming and extending the authority of the false decretals, which may be found scattered through the whole: for during more than three centuries no other canons were known than those of this collection; none other were followed in the schools and at the courts. Gratian had even gone farther than these decretals in order to extend the authority of the pope, maintaining that the pope was not subject to the canons: this he said of himself; and without adducing any proof of authority. Thus was formed in the Latin Church a confused idea, that the power of the pope was without bounds; and this principle once established, many consequences were drawn from it, in accordance with the articles formally expressed in the false decretals; and the modern theologians have

"Je sais que cette foule de prélats et d'autres étrangers que divers intérêts attiroient à Rome, y apportoit de grandes richesses, et que son peuple s'engraissoit aux depens de tous les autres : mais j'ai honte de faire mention d'un tel avantage lors qu'il s'agit de la religion. Le pape étoit-il donc établi à Rome pour l'enrichir ou pour la sanctifier ?' p. xvi.

"Le décret de Gratien acheva d'affermir et d'étendre l'autorité des fausses décrétales que l'on y trouve semées partout : car pendant plus de trois siècles on ne connoissoit point d'autres canons que ceux de ce recueil, on n'en suivoit point d'autres dans les écoles et dans les tribunaux. Gratien avoit même enchéri sur ces décrétales pour étendre l'autorité du pape, soutenant qu'il n'étoit point soumis aux canons : ce qu'il dit de son chef et sans en apporter aucune preuve d'autorité. Ainsi se forma dans d'église Latine une idée confuse que la puissance du pape étoit sans bornes ; ce principe une fois posé, on en a tiré plusieurs conséquences au-delà des articles exprimés formellement dans les fausses décrétales,

not sufficiently distinguished between these opinions, and that which is essential to the catholic faith, concerning the primacy of the pope and the rules of the ancient discipline."

As the corruption of the original constitution of the Church is thus attributed by Fleury to the ignorance which followed the irruption of barbarians into the western empire, so he accounts for the greater purity of the Greek Church by remarking on their comparative love of sound learning. "Among the Greeks," saith he, "all persons of respectability studied, the laity as well as the clergy; and they instructed themselves in the original books, the Scriptures, the fathers, the ancient canons. You have seen," continues the historian, "that all their bishops, and even their patriarchs, were judged and often deposed in the councils: that they did not ask leave of the pope to assemble; and that there was no appeal to him from their decisions. Neither did they address themselves to him on the subject of the translation of bishops, nor of the erection of bishopricks: but followed the canons contained in the ancient code of the Greek Church."

"But perhaps you will say; It is not surprising that the Greeks did not address themselves to the pope, either for appeals, or any other exercise of jurisdiction, since

et les nouveaux théologiens n'ont pas assez distingué ces opinions d'avec l'essentiel de la foi catholique, touchant la primauté du pape et les règles de l'ancienne discipline."

Ib. xix. "Chez les Grecs tous les honnêtes gens étudioient, les laïques comme les clercs: et ils s'instruisoient dans les livres originaux, l'écriture, les pères, les anciens canons, . . . Vous avez vu que tous leurs évêques et les patriarches mêmes étoient jugés et souvent déposés dans les conciles: qu'on ne demandoit point au pape la permission de les assembler, et qu'on n'appelloit point à lui de leurs jugemens. On ne s'adressoit point à lui pour les translations d'évêques ni les érections d'évêchés: on suivoit les canons compris dans l'ancien code de l'église Grèceque. . . . . .

from the time of Photius, they did not recognize him as the chief of the Church. But did they address themselves to him before that time? And during that period when they were most united with the Roman Church, did they observe any part of that which I call the new discipline? They were very far from it, because the Latins themselves did not observe it, and because this discipline was then unknown throughout the whole Church."

You will see, brethren, in these extracts from one of your own best historians, a close approximation to the views of Christian antiquity which I have endeavoured to present, from the writings of the fathers. Something, indeed, Fleury allowed to Rome, in the shape of a primacy; and doubtless, with thousands of his learned and candid brethren, of whose doctrines we shall speak more largely, by and by, he would have reconciled, as well as he could, his fidelity to antiquity with his fidelity to his vows. But granting all this, I claim his acknowledgment as conclusive upon the point which I have undertaken to establish—that A CHANGE—a vast and deplorable change, has passed over your primitive doctrine. The extent of this change may still be disputed, but the fact cannot be denied.

Ib. xx. "Vous direz peut-être : Il ne faut pas s'étonner que les Grecs ne s'adressassent pas au pape, soit pour les appellations, soit pour tout le reste, puisque dès le tems de Photius, ils ne le reconnoissoit plus pour chef de l'église. Mais s'y adressoient-ils aupavarant? Et dans les tems où ils étoient le plus unis avec l'église Romaine, observoient-ils rien de ce que j'appelle nouvelle discipline? Ils n'avoient garde de la faire, puisque les Latins mêmes ne le faisoient pas : et que cette discipline étoit encore inconnue à toute l'église." . . . .

CHAPTER XXXIII.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

RESTING, for the present, from our examination of antiquity, I proceed, according to our proposed plan, to examine the two conflicting theories concerning the limits of papal power, which have excited so much serious controversy amongst yourselves. The result of this examination will prove, as it seems to me, that the claims of your canon law have never been relinquished, but continue to represent your doctrine fairly to this day.

An author of your own, whom I presume you would allow to be amongst the most unexceptionable, shall furnish my text-book on this subject. The late Charles Butler, Esq. so well known for his legal erudition, his stores of general literature, his admirable tact, and his polished urbanity, has perhaps proved one of your happiest advocates in relation to the question before us: and his work entitled, "The Book of the Roman Catholic Church," in a series of letters addressed to the distinguished Dr. Southey, having been republished at Baltimore in A.D. 1834, is probably more easy of access than any other of the later publications to which I could refer.

From his version of the creed of pope Pius IV. I extract five clauses, relating to our subject. This symbol, as he correctly states, (p. 8) "was published in 1564, in

the form of a bull, addressed to all the faithful in Christ. It was immediately received throughout the universal Church; and, since that time, has ever been considered, in every part of the world, *as an accurate and explicit summary of the Roman catholic faith.* Non-catholics, on their admission into the catholic Church, publicly repeat and testify their assent to it, without restriction or qualification."

1. The first clause of this creed, on which some remarks may be necessary, is as follows: "I most firmly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other constitutions and observances of the holy catholic and apostolic Church."

2. "I also admit the sacred Scriptures according to the sense which the holy mother Church has held, and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures; *nor will I ever take or interpret them otherwise, than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.*"

3. "I acknowledge the holy catholic and apostolical Roman Church *the mother and mistress of all Churches*, and *I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman bishop, the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ.*"

4. "*I also profess and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons, and general councils*, and particularly by the holy council of Trent; and *I also condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever condemned and anathematized by the Church.*"

5. "This true catholic faith, *out of which none can be saved*, which I now freely profess, and truly hold, I, N. promise, now and ever, most constantly to hold and profess whole and entire, with God's assistance, to the end of my life, Amen."

After setting forth this creed, the author proceeds to say, (p. 11) " It is most true, that the Roman catholics believe their doctrines to *be unchangeable:* and that it is a tenet of their creed, that *what their faith ever has been, such it was from the beginning, such it now is, and such it ever will be.*"

Now brethren, inasmuch as this, your present creed, contains an oath of " TRUE OBEDIENCE to the Roman bishop, the successor of St. Peter, the prince of the apostles and vicar of Christ," a definition of the powers of the pope is absolutely essential; since it is plainly impossible to know what *true obedience* means, unless we understand the extent to which the pope has a just right to demand it.

And here I must trouble you with several pages, extracted from Mr. Butler's able work, which well deserve your close and careful attention. " A chain of Roman-catholic writers," saith he, (p. 104) " might be supposed: on the first link we might place those who have immoderately exalted the prerogative of the pope: on the last we might place those who have unduly depressed it; and the centre link might be considered to represent the canon of the 10th session of the council of Florence, which defined that *full power was delegated to the bishop of Rome, in the person of Peter, to feed, regulate, and govern the universal Church, as expressed in the general councils and holy canons.* THIS IS THE DOCTRINE OF THE ROMAN-CATHOLIC CHURCH ON THE AUTHORITY OF THE POPE," continues Mr. Butler, " and beyond it no Roman-catholic is required to believe. Some opinions, represented by the immediate links on each side of the central link, are allowed. Those on one side, may be supposed to represent Orsi, and the author of the learned treatise entitled, *Quis est Petrus?* who explain the doctrine expressed in the council of Florence, in a

manner very favourable to the papal prerogative; while the intermediate links on the other side, represent Bossuet, La Marca, and other writers, who construe the canon in a more limited sense. The former have received the appellation of *Transalpine* divines; the latter are called *Cisalpine*. I will endeavour to present a short view of their different systems; first premising what the Roman-catholic Church considers to be of faith upon this important article of her creed."

"*Universal doctrine of the Roman-catholics respecting the supremacy of the pope.*"

"It is an article of Roman-catholic faith, that the pope has, by divine right, first, a supremacy of rank; second, a supremacy of jurisdiction in the spiritual concerns of the Roman-catholic Church; and third, the principal authority in defining articles of faith. In consequence of these prerogatives, the pope holds a rank, *splendidly pre-eminent*, over the highest dignitaries of the Church; has a right to convene councils, and preside over them by himself, or his legates, and to confirm the election of bishops. *Every ecclesiastical cause may be brought to him as the last resort, by appeal; he may promulgate definitions and formularies of faith to the universal Church; and when the general body or a great majority of her prelates, have assented to them, either by formal consent, or tacit assent, all are bound to acquiesce in them. Rome*, they say, in such a case, *has spoken, and the cause is determined.* To the pope, in the opinion of all Roman-catholics, belongs also a general superintendence of the concerns of the Church; *a right when the canons provide no line of action, to direct the proceedings;* and, *in extraordinary cases, to act in opposition to the canons.* In those spiritual concerns, in which, by strict right, his authority

is not definitive, *he is entitled to the highest respect, and deference.* Thus far, there is no difference of opinion among Roman-catholics: but here, they divaricate into the Transalpine and Cisalpine opinions."

"*Difference between the Transalpine and Cisalpine doctrines, on the temporal and spiritual power of the pope.*"

"The great difference between the Transalpine and Cisalpine divines on the power of the pope, formerly was, that the *Transalpine* divines attributed to the pope a divine right to the exercise, indirect at least, of temporal power, for effecting a spiritual good; and, in consequence of it, maintained that the supreme power of every state was so far subject to the pope, that when he deemed that the bad conduct of the sovereign rendered it essential to the good of the Church that he should reign no longer, the pope was then authorized, *by his divine commission, to deprive him of his sovereignty, and absolve his subjects from their obligations of allegiance;* and that, even on *ordinary occasions*, he might enforce obedience to his spiritual legislation and jurisdiction, *by civil penalties.* On the other hand, the Cisalpine divines affirmed, that the pope had *no right* either to interfere in temporal concerns, or to enforce obedience to his spiritual legislation or jurisdiction, by temporal power; and, consequently, *had no right to deprive a sovereign of his sovereignty, to absolve his subjects from their allegiance, or to enforce his spiritual authority over either, by civil penalties.* THIS DIFFERENCE OF OPINION EXISTS NOW NO LONGER, THE TRANSALPINE DIVINES HAVING AT LENGTH ADOPTED, ON THIS SUBJECT, THE CISALPINE OPINIONS."

Here, brethren, you will be pleased to mark with especial care the words of your advocate, because I shall by and by have occasion to recur to the passage, and ask for the EVIDENCE on which the assertion is founded.

"But though, on this important point," continues Mr. Butler, "*both parties are at last agreed*, THEY STILL DIFFER ON OTHERS."

"In spiritual concerns, the *Transalpine* opinions ascribe to the pope *a superiority and controlling power over the whole Church, should she chance to oppose his decrees*, and consequently over a general council, her representative; and the *same superiority and controlling power, even in the ordinary course of business, over the canons of the universal Church*. They describe the pope as the *fountain of all ecclesiastical order, jurisdiction, and dignity*. They assign to him the power of judging all persons in spiritual concerns; of calling all spiritual causes to his cognizance; *of constituting, suspending, and deposing bishops; of conferring all ecclesiastical dignities and benefices, in or out of his dominions, by paramount authority; of exempting individuals and communities from the jurisdiction of their prelates; of evoking to himself, or to judges appointed by him, any cause actually pending in an ecclesiastical court; and of receiving immediate appeals from all sentences of ecclesiastical courts, though they be inferior courts*, from which there is a regular appeal to an intermediate superior court. They, further, ascribe to the pope *the extraordinary prerogative* of PERSONAL INFALLIBILITY, when he undertakes to issue a solemn decision on any point of faith."

"The Cisalpines affirm, that in spirituals the pope is subject, in doctrine and discipline, to the Church, and to a general council representing her; that he is subject to the canons of the Church, and cannot, except in an extreme case, dispense with them; that even in such a case, his dispensation is subject to the judgment of the Church; that the bishops derive their jurisdiction from God himself immediately, and not derivatively through the pope; that he has no right to confer bishoprics, or

other spiritual benefices of any kind, the patronage of which, by common right, prescription, concordat, or any other general rule of the Church, is vested in another. They admit that an appeal lies to the pope from the sentence of the metropolitan; but assert, that no appeal lies to the pope, and that he can evoke no cause to himself, during the intermediate process. They affirm, that a general council may without, and even against, the pope's consent reform the Church. They deny his personal infallibility, and hold that he may be deposed by the Church, or a general council, for heresy or schism; and they admit that in an extreme case, where is a great division of opinion, an appeal lies from the pope to a general council."

"Such are the Transalpine, and such the Cisalpine opinions respecting the power of the pope," concludes Mr. Butler.—"*Both are tolerated by the Roman-catholic Church*, BUT NEITHER SPEAKS ITS FAITH: this, as I have mentioned, is contained in the canon of the council of Florence, which I have cited. All the doctrine of that canon on the point in question, and nothing but that doctrine, is propounded by the Roman-catholic Church to be believed by the faithful: for this doctrine, but for this doctrine only, and the consequences justly deducible from it, are the Roman-catholics answerable."

The whole ground, brethren, may now be considered fairly open before us; and I shall commence the proposed examination in the ensuing chapter.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

THE plain statements of your learned and ingenious advocate being exhibited in his own words, the fact is not to be disputed, that there are four definitions of the papal supremacy recognised amongst you:

1. The *Transalpine* doctrine, which, besides all his other prerogatives, ascribes to the pope, *by divine right*, the power of dethroning sovereigns, and absolving subjects from their allegiance, and enforcing his authority by civil penalties.

2. The *Transalpine* doctrine, which rejects this exercise of supreme *temporal* power; but still grants to the pope a perfect control over councils, bishops, canons, and all causes of a spiritual nature; considering him as the fountain of ecclesiastical order, jurisdiction, and dignity, entitled to confer all ecclesiastical benefices, in or out of his dominions; authorized to exempt communities and individuals from the jurisdiction of their own prelates, and endowed with infallibility whenever he undertakes to decide on any point of faith.

3. The *Cisalpine* doctrine, which reduces the pope to a measure of dignity inferior to general councils, and makes him subject to the Church; which places infallibility in the decision of the whole Church, speaking by

general councils approved by the pope, but which still allows an appeal to his judgment, as the last resort in all ecclesiastical causes, and acknowledges that he may go in opposition to the canons, *in extreme cases.*

4. And fourthly, the *doctrine of the council of Florence*, which, according to our author, is the only one binding on the Roman-catholic as a matter of faith; for he tells us, that although the Church of Rome *tolerates* the second and third of the above doctrines, yet neither of them represents her fairly. Now the language of the council of Florence, as translated by your advocate, is this: that "FULL POWER WAS DELEGATED TO THE BISHOP OF ROME, IN THE PERSON OF PETER, TO FEED, REGULATE, AND GOVERN THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH, AS EXPRESSED IN THE GENERAL COUNCILS AND HOLY CANONS." But what this phrase, *full power*, means, Mr. Butler will not allow us to learn, either from the Transalpine divines, or from their Cisalpine opponents; nor has he been pleased to inform us himself; so that if I designed to turn Roman-catholic to-morrow, and were called upon, according to your rule, to *promise and swear* TRUE OBEDIENCE *to the bishop of Rome*, I should despair of finding any standard by which to measure the extent of this comprehensive obligation.

But this is not the whole of my embarrassment, since I am perfectly unable to discover any evidence for Mr. Butler's assertion, that the first and strongest of the Transalpine expositions, which claims the temporal as well as the spiritual supremacy for the pope, has been abandoned.

Was not this the prevailing sentiment in the year 1564, when pope Pius IV. set forth the very creed which is now presented as the universally received summary of your system?

Was it not the doctrine of your Church when a subse-

quent pope, Pius V., acted on the principle, by publishing his famous bull, deposing queen Elizabeth, and absolving her subjects from their oath of allegiance?

Was it not the doctrine of your Church, when that bull was renewed by pope Sixtus Quintus? Mr. Butler, admitting these unquestionable facts in his 222nd page, does indeed say, "You cannot express yourself concerning these transactions in stronger terms of condemnation than I have used." Nor do I question, brethren, the sincerity of the censures which he, and thousands of your communion, have passed upon them: but, after all, do these censures make or alter your doctrine? Or, are we to suppose that the pope, and the body of Transalpine divines, who had so long supported *the divine right* of this prerogative, have now abandoned it, simply because it has of late years been disapproved by their Cisalpine brethren?

It was in the latter end of the seventeenth century, viz. A. D. 1682, when the clergy of France made the first successful assault upon this doctrine, in their famous *Declaration*, explicitly pronouncing that "kings and sovereigns are not subjected to any ecclesiastical power, by the order of God, in temporal things; and their subjects cannot be dispensed from the obedience which they owe to them, nor absolved from their oath of allegiance[1]." And how, I beseech you, was this declaration received? Hear the account, brethren, given by a distinguished author among yourselves. "No sooner was it published," saith he, "than a *multitude of writers*, excited by different motives, hastened to combat it. Some, delivering themselves with a blind zeal to every thing which the

[1] *Abrégé de la Défense de la Déclaration de l'Assemblée du Clergé de France, de* 1682, *Introduction*, p. iv. "Les rois et les souverains ne sont soumis à aucune puissance ecclésiastique, par l'ordre de Dieu, dans les choses temporelles; leurs sujets ne peuvent être dispensés de l'obéissance qu'ils leur doivent, ni absous du serment de fidélité."

spirit of party could inspire, of tricks, of subtilties, of false applications, accommodated the writings of the fathers to their own opinions, instead of rectifying their opinions by the wisdom and authority of those writings. The others, forgetful even of the laws of decency, and borrowing from a scandalous animosity the most reproachful qualifications, spoke only of thunders and anathemas against the bishops of France[1]." And had the bishops of France been exposed to the storm with no other protection than the strength of their argument, the result might have proved, that these menaces were not intended to evaporate in words alone.

But you know, brethren, that the powerful influence of Louis XIV. was immediately displayed in defence of his clergy, who, on this occasion, had not so much preceded, as followed the judgment of their royal master. The Declaration bears date the 19th of March, 1682, and only four days afterwards, viz. on the 23d of the same month, the edict of the throne was registered in the parliament of France. By this edict the king forbade all persons, secular and regular, subjects or strangers, throughout his dominions, to teach or write any thing contrary to this famous Declaration, and enjoined it strictly upon the archbishops, bishops, doctors of divinity, licentiates, &c. to inculcate diligently the doctrine therein contained. [2] Whether, under these circumstances, the *toleration* of the *Cisalpine* doctrine on this

[1] Ib. " A peine cette declaration fut-elle publiée, qu'une multitude d'écrivains, excités par différens motifs, s'empressèrent de la combattre. Les uns se livrant avec un zèle aveugle à tout ce que l'esprit de parti peut inspirer de détours, de subtilités, de fausses applications, accommodoient les écrits des pères à leurs opinions, au lieu de rectifier leurs opinions sur la sagesse et l'autorité de ces écrits. Les autres, oubliant jusq'aux lois de la décence, et empruntant d'une scandaleuse animosité les qualifications les plus injurieuses, ne parloient que de foudres et d'anathèmes contre les évêques de France :"

[2] Ibid. At the end.

particular subject, was considered a point of necessary policy, lest the powerful kingdom of France should be for ever lost to the Church of Rome, as England had been, by an ill-timed severity, is a question which I leave to the judgment of wiser heads than mine.

Certain it is, however, that the difficulty created by this Declaration was not accommodated soon, nor without trouble. For "we must confess," saith the same author, "that some clouds arose between the court of Rome and France, upon the subject of the Declaration of the clergy; and that pope *Innocent* XI. refused for some time to send bulls of institution to several bishops named for vacant dioceses. But all these clouds were dissipated by the letters which these bishops wrote to pope Innocent XII., EACH FOR HIMSELF, PROTESTING TO HIS HOLINESS, THAT THE CLERGY OF FRANCE HAD NEVER INTENDED TO MAKE A DECREE OF FAITH BY THEIR DECLARATION, AND ASSURING HIM BESIDES OF THEIR PROFOUND SUBMISSION TO THE RIGHTS OF THE HOLY CHAIR. *Innocent XII. exacted nothing farther*, says M. Bossuet, *and all the clamours, all the machinations, all the menaces of our enemies did not hinder this pope, truly holy, from receiving us and all the clergy of France with kindness and charity, in his paternal bosom*[1]."

[1] Ibid. Introduction, p. xxv. "Ici cependant nous devons convenir qu'il s'éleva quelques nuages entre la cour de Rome et la France, au sujet de la déclaration du clergé, et que le pape *Innocent xi.* refusa pendant quelque temps des bulles d'institution à plusieurs évêques nommés à des siéges vacans. Mais tous ces nuages furent dissipés par les lettres que ces évêques nommés écrivirent au pape *Innocent xii.* chacun en leur particulier, pour protester à sa sainteté que le clergé de France n'avoit jamais eu l'intention de faire un décret de foi par sa déclaration; l'assurant d'ailleurs de leur profonde soumission aux droits du St. Siége. *Innocent XII. n'en exigea pas davantage*, dit M. Bossuet, et toutes les clameurs, toutes les machinations, toutes les menaces de nos ennemis n'empêchèrent pas ce pape, vraiment saint, de nous recevoir et tout le Clergé de France, avec douceur et charité dans son sein paternel."

It appears, then, that the supposed abandonment of the pope's temporal power rests on nothing stronger than the unwilling *sufferance* of a declaration which was certainly disapproved by Innocent XI.; as certainly *not approved* by his successor; and made the subject of something very like an apology, by the French bishops themselves. I confess I cannot see in this, a sufficient warrant for Mr. Butler's assertion that "the TRANSALPINE DIVINES HAVE AT LENGTH ADOPTED ON THIS SUBJECT THE CISALPINE OPINIONS."

It is indeed said, that Mr. Pitt suggested to the English Roman-catholics, three questions embracing this topic, to be sent to the universities of the Sorbonne, Louvaine, Douay, Alcala, and Salamanca; the answers to which were all returned in accordance to the Cisalpine doctrine. And it is equally unquestionable that the oath taken by the English Roman-catholics, under the provisions of the Act passed for their relief, in the year 1791, condemns and abjures the doctrine of the pope's temporal power in plain terms[1]. But how do these facts affect the question? Have these five universities, and the British Roman-catholics, *without the assent of either pope or council*, power to pronounce an authoritative construction in a case like this? You know, brethren, that such an allegation would be regarded by you all as totally preposterous.

Let me, therefore, solicit your serious attention to the true state of the question. That it is of the very highest importance to yourselves, from the pope, who claims this *true obedience*, down to the lowest and the least who *swears* that he will faithfully render it, can be denied by no man. It enters into your creed, the creed of pope Pius IV., which your Church allows to be the universally

[1] See Appendix to Mr. Butler's book, p. 287, 8, and 9.

received summary of your faith. *Out of this faith*, saith this creed in its last clause, "NONE CAN BE SAVED;" and herein it well sustains the Doway catechism, which declares, "that he *who has not a due subordination and connexion to the pope and councils*, MUST NEEDS BE DEAD, and cannot be accounted a member of the Church" in any sense whatever. A principle so fundamental, so universal, so essential, in your esteem, to the very being of your Church, ought surely to be *understood and satisfactorily defined amongst yourselves*. Instead of which, your own able advocate, himself a profound jurist, and better qualified, perhaps, than any man in England, to put your doctrine of papal supremacy in the most favourable light, gives us *four* statements of the matter, of which three are perfectly irreconcilable: and the remaining one, the canon of Florence, which he pronounces to be the only one that truly represents the faith of the Church, was generally interpreted, for many successive centuries, to mean, what your advocate tells us, is now as generally abandoned. And yet the doctrines of your Church are pronounced *unchangeable;* for it is a tenet of your creed, in the words of Mr. Butler, that what your faith "*ever has been, such it now is, and such it ever will be.*" Ah, brethren! you will not blame my stupidity if I cannot comprehend the *unchangeableness* of a creed, the meaning of which its own best friends find it so hard to discover: since they refer us to three different and jarring interpretations of the same thing, and then gravely inform us that we cannot depend upon any of them.

But there is one feature of your papal system in which you all agree. It is this: that the pope, whatever his other powers may be, *is the supreme judge of the Church*. For in the section of Mr. Butler's work where he lays down the *universal doctrine* of the Roman-catholics

respecting the supremacy of the pope, he expressly says[1]:

"It is an article of Roman-catholic faith that the pope has, *by divine right*, 1. a supremacy of rank, 2. a supremacy of jurisdiction in the spiritual concerns of the Roman-catholic Church, and 3. the principal authority in defining articles of faith."—"Every ecclesiastical cause *may be brought to him*, AS THE LAST RESORT, *by appeal*; he may promulgate definitions and formularies of faith to the universal Church, and when the general body, or a great majority of the prelates, have assented to them, *either by formal consent, or tacit assent*, ALL ARE BOUND TO ACQUIESCE. Rome, they say, in such a case, has spoken, and the cause is determined."—"Thus far," saith your advocate, in conclusion, "*there is no difference of opinion among Roman-catholics.*"

Now, brethren, I beseech you tell me, what is the worth of your *Cisalpine* definition, according to the above principle *of faith*, admitted by all? Until the pope, who is the only judge in the last resort, has given his formal decision, where is the authority of your latter doctrine? And therefore I cannot help thinking, that Mr. Butler, who was so profoundly versed in legal science, must have smiled within himself at the weakness of his argument, when he urged the oath established by the British parliament for the Roman-catholics, and the answers of *five universities*, and the opinions of the Gallican and English divines, with others, as settling such a question. If Mr. Pitt had doubts concerning the powers of the Lord Chancellor of England, it would be an amusing device to recommend the declaration of an assembly of country justices, and the opinions of five chamber counsellors, in the very face of the authoritative decrees and practice

[1] See page 352.

of the Court of Chancery itself. And if, on such grounds as these, men should be told, that the former principles of equity in England had been abandoned, such an assurance would hardly be thought worthy of any other answer than a smile of contempt. But I pray you, brethren, how much more to the purpose has been the course taken on the question before us? The pope, you tell us, *by divine right*, holds a supremacy of jurisdiction. All questions may be determined by him in *the last resort*, by appeal. *Rome has then spoken*, according to your phraseology, *and the cause is determined*. Has this cause been so determined, against the Transalpine, or in favour of the Cisalpine opinions? Has there been any appeal to Rome upon the question? Nay, in the selection of his five universities, did not Mr. Pitt set down *three* who were *previously known* to hold the Cisalpine opinions, the Sorbonne, Louvaine, and Doway, (the only three, with the answers of which Mr. Butler's work has favoured us) while the other two were the universities of *Alcala* and *Salamanca*, so that not one of the five was even on Italian territory! So fearful does he seem to have been of the real doctrine of Rome.

But *Rome has spoken*, and the cause *has been determined*, over and over again, according to your own unquestioned records. From the days of Gregory VII. down to the time of Sixtus V. the claim of temporal as well as spiritual supremacy was constantly proposed by the popes as an article of faith, acquiesced in both tacitly and professedly by the great body of the Church, and therefore, by your own principles, irrevocably bound upon the whole. It is not my object, brethren, to enter more deeply into historical details than the nature of my subject requires; but let me cite a few sentences from the book last quoted, in order to show, *from the facts admitted by the Cisalpines themselves*, how the question must stand, in the event of

your submitting the canon of Florence to the construction of your only definitive tribunal.

"Gregory is the first," saith our author, "who endeavoured to subject all the crowns to the obedience of the popes in temporal things [1]."

"After the death of Gregory VII. there were many provincial councils holden, in which what he had done was approved: chiefly, however, under Victor III. and Urban II.; afterwards Calixtus II., in a council at Rheims, excommunicated Henry V., and gave his subjects absolution from their oath of allegiance; so completely had the example of Gregory VII. established this false doctrine in the mind of the Romans. What took place between Alexander III. and Frederic I., between Innocent III., the emperor Otho, and John, king of England, is equally the fruit of the enterprise of this first author of the papal monarchy [2]."

"The third canon of the council of Lateran, held under Innocent III., commands all feudal lords to banish heretics from their lands, to take an oath concerning it, and in case any one should fail to fulfil it for a whole year, it directs that the pope be apprised, in order that he may expose the property of the offender for a prey, and absolve his vassals from their obedience [3]." I may observe here,

[1] Abrégé de la défense de la déclaration de l'assemblée du Clergé de France, p. 10. Innovations de Grégoire VII.

"Grégoire est le premier qui ait voulu assujettir toutes les couronnes à l'obéissance des papes, dans les choses temporelles."

[2] Ibid. p. 11. "Après la mort de Grégoire VII. il se tint plusieurs *conciles particuliers*, où l'on approuva ce qu'il avoit fait; et principalement sous Victor III. et Urbain II. ensuite Calixte II., dans un concile de Reims, excommunia Henri V., et donna à ses sujets l'absolution du serment de fidélité; tant l'exemple de Grégoire VII. avoit établi cette fausse doctrine dans l'esprit des Romains."

[3] Ib. p. 12. "Le troisième canon du iv. Concile de Latran, tenu sous Innocent III., ordonne à tous les seigneurs de chasser les hérétiques de leurs terres, d'en faire le serment, et en cas que quelqu'un y manque

brethren, that your Cisalpine author labours to distinguish this case from the case of sovereigns; but manifestly, even on his own ground, it would be only a question of degrees. The principle involved in the case of the sovereign and in that of the feudal lord, is precisely the same. If the council was infallible in sanctioning the one, it would be equally infallible in sanctioning the other.

Again, your author acknowledges, that [1] "The council of Trent, in the xxv. session, deprives princes of the possession of cities, in which they permit duels." His argument to evade this fact is amusing. "The council marks clearly enough," saith he, "that it only speaks of those places which princes hold as fiefs of the Church. And this decree was rejected in the Parliament of Paris, in 1593, as being contrary to the rights of sovereigns, although it was during the period of the league. And besides it was only a decree of discipline."

You perceive clearly, brethren, the weakness of this reasoning, when applied to the main question, viz. whether the Church of Rome maintained that princes were subject, in temporals as well as spirituals, to the pope's authority. If the French parliament thought the council of Trent referred only to the fiefs of the Church, why was this decree rejected as contrary to the rights of sovereigns? And even if it were limited to the fiefs of the Church, by what right could the council of Trent add a *new condition* to the tenure—and one so important that a breach of it should work a forfeiture—unless it were

dans un an, il ordonne que le pape en soit averti, pour exposer leurs biens en proie, et absoudre leurs vassaux de l'obéissance qu'ils leur doivent."

[1] Ib. p. 13. "Le concile de Trente, dans la xxv. session, prive les princes de la possession des villes, dans lesquelles ils permettent le duel. Mais ce concile marque assez clairement, qu'il ne parle que des lieux que les princes tiennent en fiefs de l'Eglise. Et on rejeta ce décret dans les états tenus à Paris, en 1593, comme contraires aux droits des souverains; quoique ces états fussent tenus pendant la *ligue*. Ce n'étoit d'ailleurs qu'un decrét de discipline."

by the general right which had been claimed over all princes for centuries before?

But I proceed to another example, which your author admits and endeavours to evade, as follows: [1] "Pope Innocent IV.," saith he, "assembled a council at Lyons, in which he deposed the emperor Frederick II. or rather he confirmed the deposition of this prince, declared by Gregory IX. some years before. We shall grant, in the first place, that the opinion of the power of the popes, concerning the deposition of princes, was then so diffused, that there were none but the most enlightened persons who sustained the ancient doctrine. But we shall also say, that the deposition of the emperor was not a decree of the council. It was only *a pontifical sentence, pronounced in the presence of the council*, and not *by the authority of the council*. We shall say that Innocent IV. supposing, without hesitation, that he could depose a prince who abused his authority, deliberated only whether Frederic deserved this punishment; but that he never took into consideration, whether, by force of the papal power, he could bind the emperor and loose his subjects; which would have been necessary, in order that this article

[1] Ib. "Innocent IV. assembla un concile à Lyon, dans lequel il déposa l'empereur Frédéric II. ou plutôt il confirma la déposition de ce prince, faite par Grégoire IX., quelques années auparavant. Nous conviendrons d'abord que l'opinion du pouvoir des papes, touchant la déposition des princes, étoit alors tellement répandue, qu'il n'y avoit que les personnes les plus éclairées qui soutinssent l'ancienne vérité. Mais nous dirons aussi que la déposition de l'empereur ne fut pas un décret du concile. Ce ne fut qu'une sentence pontificale, prononcée en *présence du concile*, et non *par l'autorité du concile*.—Nous dirons qu' Innocent IV. supposant, sans hésiter, qu'il pouvoit déposer un prince qui abusoit de son autorité, délibéra seulement si les fautes de Frédéric meritoient cette peine, mais qu'il ne mit nullement en délibération, si, en vertu du pouvoir pontifical, il pouvoit lier l'empereur et délier ses sujets, ce qui auroit été nécessaire pour faire passer cet article, comme une chose décidée par l'Eglise. Nous dirons enfin que si c'étoit une décision d'un

might be passed for a matter decided by the Church. We shall say, in fine, that if this were a decision of a general council, it would be a heresy to maintain the contrary. And yet they have never treated as heretics, either the faculty of Theology of Paris, or the parliament of France, who have maintained that the dependence of kings was contrary to the word of God."

Here, brethren, it seems to me, that your Cisalpine logician is particularly unfortunate. For first, he relies on the weak distinction, that what was done *in* the council could not be said to be approved *by* the council. A much better argument is urged by Bossuet, when it suited his purpose, in another part of the same book, where, even on the supposition that the council of Constance was not a general council, he yet very properly contends, that if it published an unanimous decree, *which was in no respect censured by the Church*, no one should presume to assail it. "For," saith he[1], "here is precisely the case where the maxim ought to be applied: *Not to oppose error is to approve it:* a maxim chiefly true, when questions of faith are concerned, and above all, when error comes forward under the name of a general council. Silence on such an occasion becomes a real approbation, at least on the part of those, who, in quality of bishops, and of the pope, the chief of the Church, are by their rank obliged to speak." Apply

concile général, ce seroit une hérésie de soutenir le contraire. Et cependant jamais on n'a traité d'hérétiques, ni la faculté de théologie de Paris, ni les parlemens de France, qui ont soutenu que la dépendance des rois étoit contraire à la parole de Dieu."

[1] Ibid. p. 216. "Car voilà précisément le cas où doit avoir lieu cette maxime: *c'est approuver l'erreur que de ne pas s'y opposer:* maxime principalement vraie, lorsqu'il s'agit des questions de foi, et surtout lorsque l'erreur se produit sous le nom d'un concile œcuménique. Le silence dans une telle circonstance devient une véritable approbation, au moins de la part de ceux qui, en qualité d'évêques, et de pape chef de l'église, sont par leur état obligés de parler."

this passage, brethren, to the act of Innocent IV., done in the council of Lyons, and it is surely conclusive upon the sense of your Church in reference to the point in question.

But in the second place, your author grants, that Innocent, in this instance, *confirmed* what *Gregory IX. had done some years before;* that the opinion was then *so diffused* that "*none but the most enlightened sustained the ancient doctrine;*" and that the pope supposed, *without hesitation*, that he possessed the power of deposing princes. What better proof than this could be required, to exhibit the strength of the precedents which had been followed so long by your supreme ecclesiastical judges? The point was *taken for granted*, assumed *without hesitation*, as a principle which needed not to be considered formally by the council, because no man was supposed to question its truth.

The concluding remarks of your Cisalpine author, where he asserts, that "if this were the decision of the council it would be heresy to maintain the contrary, and yet the French who opposed the doctrine had never been treated as heretics," seems, to my mind, to be weakness itself. That immediately upon the Declaration of 1682 they had been *denounced as heretics*, by the Transalpine divines, is asserted by Bossuet in the plainest terms. [1] "They have gone so far," saith he, "as to proscribe the Declaration, as *favouring heretics*, despoiling the Roman pontiff of his primacy, overturning the apostolic chair; absurd, detestable, perilous in faith, distilling the venom of the most frightful schism, under a false covering of piety.

[1] Ibid. 42. "Ils vont jusqu'à le proscrire comme favorisant les hérétiques, dépouillant le pontife Romain de sa primauté, renversant le siége apostolique; absurde, détestable, périlleux dans la foi, distillant le venin du schisme le plus affreux, au travers d'une fausse écorce de piété. Mais le plus furieux de tous, c'est l'archevêque de Valence. Il commence par dire que quiconque n'admet pas l'infaillibilité du pape est hérétique."

But the most furious of them all," continues he, "is the archbishop of Valentia. He begins by saying that *whoever does not admit the infallibility of the pope is a heretic.*" That they had not also been *treated* as heretics —that the popes have *suffered* the Cisalpine doctrine to be broached and defended—is indeed true; but it may be accounted for by a simple recurrence to the *temper of the times.* Surely, however, brethren, it cannot be necessary for me to remind you, that the *doctrine* of your ecclesiastical law is one thing; and the *execution* of it is another.

I ask, therefore, that you will add these examples to the instances in English history which Mr. Butler deplores; and I shall put it to your own good sense and candour to say, what would the supreme judge of all ecclesiastical questions—the pope himself—be likely to pronounce, if the point were submitted to him, instead of to the Cisalpine divines, and the five selected universities? Granting, if you please, that the canon of the council of Florence is your RULE OF FAITH, as Mr. Butler, your able advocate, states so expressly; you know, full well, brethren, that laws are always best understood, when they have received their construction from judicial authority. And although it is admitted, that construction, however long established, may be changed, yet it is a settled maxim that it ought not to be changed, without the strongest and most weighty reasons. But what reasons could be assigned for passing a new construction on the canon of Florence? Would it not be the duty of the pope to consider, that before this council was holden, the practice of his predecessors, with the sanction of several councils, had fixed the claim of the temporal supremacy; that the fathers of Florence were, therefore, perfectly familiar with the doctrine; and that there is nothing in the language of the canon intimating the design of disturbing its exercise? For if they had intended to restrict this power, it is plain that they would

have intimated it by *negative* words. Since the world began, laws intended to restrain existing evils, have been expressed in the language of prohibition. Instead of which, the canon professes to establish nothing new, but gives the sanction of the council to all that had been done, by saying, that *full power was delegated to the bishop of Rome in the person of Peter*, to feed, regulate, and govern the universal Church," &c. Would not the pope be further likely to consider, that after the passage of this canon, there was a continuance of the same claims and acts of deposition as before, without any other obstacle than that which the resistance of the sovereigns themselves occasionally presented: that the clergy made no objection, save in France; and that even there, when Innocent III. issued his bull against king John of England, deposing him, and at the same time charged Philip Augustus, king of France, to execute this sentence, and take possession of the vacant throne, the French king admitted, without scruple, the validity of the transfer, and prepared to avail himself of the papal prerogative accordingly? I believe history does not record any opposition of the clergy of France on that occasion. With all these centuries of precedents, with the claims of papal consistency at stake, with the whole edifice of ecclesiastical infallibility to be sustained or prostrated by his decision, could you expect the pope to sanction any other construction, than that which his predecessors had established? Surely not, my brethren. And therefore I am compelled to conclude, that the oath to render *true obedience* to your supreme pontiff, takes high precedence of every human obligation, as your system now stands; and that there is, as yet, no sufficient warrant for any other definition of papal power, than that which has been inscribed upon the history of nations—alas! for the honour of Christianity—in characters of blood.

CHAPTER XXXV.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

I SHALL devote a short chapter to the consideration of the change which has taken place in the mode of electing the pope, and to such particulars of the ceremonies established at his installation, as may assist in fixing the construction of his powers, according to the best information I can obtain of your present system.

That the bishop of Rome, as well as all other bishops, was elected in primitive times, by the clergy of his own city and diocese, with the concurring suffrages of the people, is a fact so manifest throughout the writings of the fathers, that it cannot be, and never has been, questioned by any. The extract on p. 115, from the letter of Cyprian to Cornelius, bishop of Rome, would of itself be conclusive on the point, and you are doubtless familiar, besides, with the learned treatise of your own P. Sirmondi, S. I. inserted in the fifth volume of Hardouin's Councils, (p. 1426.) where the subject is treated at large, and formularies are given for the holding of these ancient elections [1].

[1] "Vetus olim totius ecclesiæ mos fuit, episcopos cleri et plebis cui præfuturi erant, suffragiis creari. Sic enim, ut altius non repetam, Cornelium Romæ clericorum suffragio episcopum factum, Cyprianus epist. 41 et 52, &c. In occidentalibus ecclesiis jus idem suffragii populo in renunciandis episcopis etiam post Synodum Nicænam perseverasse, tum

It appears, however, that after the establishment of Christianity in the Roman empire, the sovereigns exercised the right of confirming the election of the pope; from which the transition was not difficult to their endeavouring to select the persons to be chosen. After much contest and bickering upon the subject, which it is beside our design to detail, it was left to the cardinals, in the 11th century, to elect the popes, without any interference on the part of emperor, senate, or people; and such has been the course pursued from that period to the present day [1].

The mode usually followed, and styled election by *scrutiny*, is certainly the most extraordinary known in the history of man. The cardinals, shut up in what is called the conclave—not allowed to hold converse with any one whatever—their food examined by persons appointed for the purpose, lest any secret billet might be enclosed—every door of access guarded with the utmost vigilance; and all this adopted as an established system, for the purpose of securing a result which is to be attributed to the divine direction, presents, brethren, as you will readily allow, a most striking contrast to the simplicity and transparency of the primitive ages.

The ceremonies which take place after the election, are too numerous for insertion; and I shall only mention a few of those which bear, most directly, upon the official character which the pope is supposed to sustain.

Romanorum Pontificum Siricii, Cælestini, Leonis, decreta, quæ cleri plebisque consensu eligendos statuunt; tum Damasi, Ambrosii, Augustini, Fulgentii, et aliorum, quos eo modo creatos constat, innumera passim exempla declarant."

[1] See Cérémonies et Coutumes Religieuses par B. Picard, tom. i. p. 42. note c. The tone of this writer is so far from what it ought to be, that I should not cite him for any fact likely to be called in question.

Thus, it appears that he is adored three times; first, in the chapel where the election is held, "the dean of the cardinals, and after him, the other cardinals, adore his holiness on their knees, kiss his foot, and then his right hand," &c. Again, the "pope is placed *on the altar* in the chapel of Sixtus, where the cardinals come and adore the second time," in the same manner. And again, "the pope is carried in his pontifical chair, under a grand canopy of red fringed with gold, to the Church of St. Peter, where he is placed *upon the grand altar*, and the cardinals adore him for the third time, and after them, the ambassadors of princes," &c.[1]

At his coronation, he is seated on his throne, and an anthem is sung, the words of which are the prophecy of the psalmist, relative to Christ: "*Thou shalt set a crown of pure gold upon his head*," *&c.* . . . . "The second cardinal deacon takes the mitre from him, and the first puts the tiara on his head, saying: *Receive this tiara which is adorned with three crowns, and forget not, in wearing it, that you are the father of princes and of kings, the ruler of the world, and on earth the vicar of Jesus*

[1] Ibid. p. 50. "Le pape est porté dans sa chaire devant l'autel de la chapelle où s'est faite l'élection, et c'est là que le cardinal doien, et ensuite les autres cardinaux adorent à genoux sa sainteté, lui baisent le pied, puis la main droite :" &c. . . . . "Le même jour deux heures avant la nuit, le pape revêtu de la chappe et couvert de sa mitre est porté sur l'autel de la Chapel de Sixte, où les cardinaux avec leurs chappes violettes viennent adorer une seconde fois le nouveau pontife qui est assis sur les reliques de la pierre sacrée. Cette adoration se fait comme la première," &c. . . . . "les cardinaux précedés de la musique descendent au milieu de l'église de St. Pierre. Le pape vient ensuite porté dans son siége pontifical sous un grand dais rouge embelli de franges d'or. Les estafiers le mettent sur le grand autel de St. Pierre, où les cardinaux l'adorent pour la troisième fois, et après eux les ambassadeurs des princes," &c.

Christ our Saviour [1]." It may be observed, by the way, that "pope Urban V. is said to have been the first who wore the three crowns. Before him, only one crown was placed on the head of the Roman pontiff. And the first coronation spoken of in the history of the popes, is that of Damasus II. in 1048 [2]." The tiara is described as being a "conical cap, adorned with three crowns blazing with precious stones, of inestimable value. The one worn by pope Clement VIII. was supposed to be worth five hundred thousand pieces of gold [3]." The magnificence of all the other appendages of the pontiff may be imagined from this specimen, without wearying your attention by details, with which you are doubtless far more intimately acquainted than I.

Now, I will not insult your understandings, brethren, by asking, whether you think that these matters and such as these, belonged to the early Church of Rome. Neither shall I discuss the question whether the primitive mode of election could lawfully have been laid aside, without a far higher sanction than is pretended; the more especially as the plan now followed is directly opposed to a canon of the council of Nice [4]. But it is

[1] Ib. p. 55. "Désque le pape s'est assis (sur le trône) le chœur chante l'antienne *Corona aurea super caput*, &c. avec les *répons*. . . . Le second cardinal diacre ôte la mitre au pontife, et le premier lui met le trirègne sur la tête en lui disant, Accipe tiaram tribus coronis ornatam, et scias te esse patrem principum et regum, rectorem orbis, in terra vicarium Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi," &c.

[2] Ib. 52 note. "Le pape Urbain V. fut le premier qui porta les trois couronnes. Avant lui on n'en mettoit qu'une sur la tête des pontifes. Le premier couronnement dont il est parlé dans l'histoire des papes, c'est celui de Damase second, en 1048."

[3] Ib. 55, note f. "Ce bonnet conique orné de trois couronnes toutes brillantes de pierreries est d'un prix inestimable. Celui que le pape Paul II. consacra, quoique chargé de joiaux, ne valoit pas le trirègne de Clement VIII. que l'on estimoit, dit on, cinq cent mille pièces d'or."

[4] Hard. Con. tom. v. p. 1426. Dissertatio Sirmondi.

The canon in question directs the ordination of bishops by *all the*

enough for my undertaking to exhibit these changes, in order to show, how well they harmonize with the system of your canon law, how consistent they are with the Transalpine construction of the council of Florence, and how unlikely it is, that the wearer of the dazzling tiara, who is exhorted, in the very act of his coronation, to remember his prerogative, as *father of kings and princes, and ruler of the world*, will ever assist his *Cisalpine* adherents to reduce his power within the moderate circle of Christian antiquity.

bishops of the province, unless in cases of necessity, when three were allowed to ordain, after the absent bishops had consented by letter. But the whole order of antiquity seems to be done away. The pope is commonly chosen from among the cardinals, many of whom are bishops, although only *titular bishops*, consecrated by the pope, for some far distant country, without the least intention of ever beholding their nominal dioceses. And neither in his election, nor in his ordination, any more than in his assumed powers, do we find any conformity to the primitive system.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

BRETHREN IN CHRIST,

PERMIT me now to express the hope, that after ages of error and darkness, so fully acknowledged by your own most learned and candid men, the time is not far distant when the true light of primitive Christianity shall be restored to the Churches; when the extravagant claims of the papal system shall be universally abandoned; when the definition of the catholic Church shall be restored to its original simplicity; when it shall again be understood that Christ himself is amongst his people, and therefore needs no vicar; that he is the Head who has mercifully declared; "*Lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world*," and therefore alone possesses the place of the true God upon the earth; and that his servants who hold the office of bishops in the Church, are, in the language of Jerome, equal, whether they be of Rome or of Eugubium; being all, alike, successors of the apostles, discharging the same ministry, and invested with the same powers.

You believe in the HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH—the Church of primitive Christianity—and so do we. You claim the right of membership in that Church, and so do we. You profess the faith held by the primitive Church, taught by the early fathers, sanctioned by the first four general councils, and so do we. And if the

Church of Rome had been satisfied with that faith—if she had abstained from those innovations which your own Cisalpine divines in part deplore,—I doubt whether any other aspect would now be presented by the universal Church, than the aspect of unity and peace.

With respect to the modern Church of Rome, we are PROTESTANTS, because we have been compelled to protest against these innovations. But with respect to the primitive Church, we profess ourselves CATHOLICS, because we symbolize with that Church in all the important points of faith and polity. May the period soon arrive, when the work begun by your own reformers shall be carried to its true extent, and the principles of the same primitive creed shall suffice to entitle all Christians to the privileges of the same primitive communion!

Meanwhile, before I lay aside my pen, let me beg you to consider a few questions of practical importance.

And in the first place I would ask, why do you insist that Christians who hold the same ancient creed, are not equally belonging to the catholic Church, because they are alienated from each other on minor points of polity or doctrine? Does a body cease to be united to its head, because one member becomes torpid, and another deformed, and a third spasmodic? Does a fold cease to be one, because the rams of the flock are accustomed to contend, instead of feeding side by side in peace? Does a family cease to be one, because the nearest relations have quarrelled? Does a crew cease to be one, because they refuse to eat together? Does a nation cease to be one, because factions and party-spirit divide the people? Take your analogy, brethren, from what you please, and you will find it equally opposed to your exclusive doctrine. The catholic Church is the body of Christ, one in him, even when unable, by reason of ecclesiastical disease, to commune in its members. The

catholic Church is the flock of the great Shepherd, one in Him, even when divided amongst each other. It is Christ's holy nation and peculiar people, even while, in itself, there may be many sources of contention and strife. When ancient Israel fell into dissensions, did they cease to be regarded as the people of God? When Paul and Barnabas separated, the one from the other, did either of them lose his title to salvation? When Victor, the bishop of Rome, excommunicated the Churches of Asia in the time of Irenæus, or when Stephen subsequently excommunicated Cyprian, did they cease to belong to the catholic Church? Hence the plain unreasonableness of your favourite notion, that union in the faith of Christ does not make us catholics, unless there be also communion with his supposed vicar, and with each other. These divisions—these strifes—these controversies, and the hateful feelings of bigotry so apt to characterise them, are all deplorable. I grant it, brethren: I write the acknowledgment with a heavy heart. But still the Church may be one catholic Church with respect to Christ—the only Head of the body—while it is manifold in reference to its members. Our union with each other is one of the results, which ought, indeed, to follow from our union with Christ our Head, just as the perfect health of the bodily system ought to be the result of the vital action. But God forbid that this divine order should be inverted. To make our union with Christ dependent upon our union with each other, would be like making our life dependent upon the health of all the bodily organs. But woe be to our bodies, if every pain and sickness of our mortal frame were death! And woe be to our souls, if every discord in the communion of the Church were destruction!

But secondly, why do you aver that the creed of the primitive catholic Church warrants you in placing the supremacy of the pope amongst the articles of faith? It

is most true that the ancient fathers, times without number, insist on the necessity of union *in the faith of the catholic Church*. But your favourite doctrine, which is the *essential* characteristic of the present Church of Rome, whereby obedience to the pope is made an article of faith itself—NECESSARY TO SALVATION—was unknown to the primitive Church. It came in along with the doctrine of papal supremacy: it grew with its growth, and strengthened with its strength, until the headship of Christ and the headship of the pope became convertible terms; and the bishop of Rome, instead of being, as at first, simply the most influential amongst equals, became the father of kings and princes, and the ruler of the world; and the very creed "*out of which no man could be saved*," presented to every human being AN OATH OF TRUE OBEDIENCE TO THE POPE, as one of the immutable and indispensable principles of the Gospel. The lamp of truth has indeed been successfully carried through this enormous fabric of error. Your own Cisalpine divines have examined its secret chambers, unrolled its archives, traced the authority for its canons, detected its frauds, and honestly and boldly, in the face of Rome herself, have proclaimed their conviction, that the primitive system had been overwhelmed—that innovation had overrun the Church—that for centuries together, ignorance and usurpation, superstition and imposture, had combined to erect a structure of power, such as the world had never beheld, and the Redeemer of the world had never authorized. All this is now confessed by every enlightened and candid mind amongst yourselves. And why, then, do you not discard from your creed a clause which you are now so well aware that usurpation placed there? Why destroy the claims which alone could justify the insertion of such an article, and yet insist upon the article itself as essential to salvation? Why not complete the noble work you have begun,

and resolutely reform according to the primitive platform, until nothing remains which cannot be truly defended by Scripture, and by the fathers and councils of the early ages?

Thirdly, Why do you, in the same creed of pope Pius IV. retain the clause by which the professor of your faith *most firmly admits and embraces apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions*, and *all other constitutions and observances of the holy catholic and apostolic Church*, when there are so many changes, variations, and innovations, brought in upon the primitive system? For where is the kiss of charity, the communion of the cup, the allowance of marriage to the clergy, the washing of feet, the standing at prayer on festivals, the open response of the people, the reading of the Scriptures and the liturgies in the vulgar tongue which the whole congregation could understand, the election of bishops, the holding provincial councils twice in every year, and the severe but wholesome discipline of the primitive system? All these are gone from amongst you. Many of them are plainly *apostolical traditions*, by the testimony of the Scriptures and the fathers. All of them are *ecclesiastical traditions*, and constitutions or observances of the holy catholic and apostolic Church. Why are men compelled to protest, solemnly before God, in that very creed out of which you tell them they cannot be saved, that they firmly admit and embrace things, about which not one in a thousand know anything, and which those who are informed, know to have been long since done away? Brethren, I beseech you to ask your own good understandings and upright hearts, how such a declaration can be justified by the laws of honesty and truth.

I would ask, in the fourth place, Why do you retain another clause of the same creed, in which the professor of your faith is bound to say: I also admit the sacred

Scriptures according to the sense which the holy mother Church has held, and does hold, *nor will I ever take or interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers*," when it is so manifest that the fathers do almost unanimously interpret your favourite texts in plain opposition to your present system? The extracts I have submitted to you in my humble performance, are of themselves more than sufficient to establish the fact. They are taken at large, and most punctiliously, from your own editions, and the evidence they furnish is not to be evaded. Is there not here, then, brethren, another palpable case of solemn misrepresentation, calling loudly for the hand of reform?

Fifthly, Why do you profess another clause of the same creed, in which the believer in your faith is made to say: "I also profess and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the holy council of Trent," when you know so well that a volume might be filled with those passages from the canons and councils which retain no place in your present system? And especially, why do you continue the clause that follows, in which the believer is bound to declare, that he "condemns, rejects, and anathematizes all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever condemned and anathematized by the Church," when you ought to be so thoroughly aware, that by making this asseveration, he may be truly said to anathematize in one part of his creed what he is bound to maintain in another?

Not only, however, would I here protest against the contradictions so manifest on the face of this your favourite creed, but against the unchristian principle of pronouncing an *anathema*—A SOLEMN CURSE—upon all heresies whatsoever. True, indeed, it is, that the primitive Church, at a very early day, adopted in her councils

this deplorable custom of cursing; but at least she confined it to errors in the fundamental articles of the faith. The climax, however, of this awful habit, appeared in the council of Trent, who applied it to every article in their whole body of divinity, and were nowhere content with cursing the error, but invariably denounced their curse upon the man that held it. Strange and melancholy fact, that the canons of this council contain not less than *one hundred and twenty-four distinct anathemas;* a large proportion of which are directed against opinions which might be holden in perfect consistency with the great doctrines of Christianity! Nay, even in the acclamations with which the fathers closed their concluding session, their partiality for this word appears again; for I find the last recorded sentence of the presiding legate was: "*Anathema to all heretics,*" and the council returned the unanimous response: ANATHEMA, ANATHEMA[1]! O brethren, if some good angel had presented before them at that moment the apostolic precept, "*Bless;* and CURSE NOT," would they not have felt reproved?

I confess that to my poor imagination, there is no spectacle more perfectly revolting, none more absolutely opposed to my notions of the ministry of reconciliation, than is presented by the picture of these two hundred and sixty-five dignitaries of your Church, recording this multitude of formal deliberate curses against millions of their fellow-creatures, who worshipped the same Triune God, believed in the same divine and incarnate Saviour, received the same Gospel, and professed the same primitive creed, with themselves. The malediction of the Almighty is a tremendous exercise of his divine prerogative, not to be invoked in any other manner than that which

[1] Hard. Conc. tom. x. p. 193.
"Card. Anathema cunctis hæreticis.
"Resp. Anathema, Anathema."

his own express word enjoins upon us, as a fearful warning to the wicked. To add to the list of curses which he has decreed—to devise new modes or subjects or occasions for the purpose, and, especially, to scatter them abroad with such a liberal hand, is an occupation not easily reconciled with the religion of love, nor with the *charity that hopeth all things.* Nor is it one of the least striking proofs of the deadly influence of religious bigotry, that the council of Trent alone should have pronounced more anathemas than the whole Bible contains; although none but God has the right to dictate a curse, as none but God has the power to inflict it.

So strangely, however, has this assumption of the divine judgment become familiarised amongst your doctors, that it is even adopted as a part of your modern *description* of the Church. Thus, in the very able tractate "De Ecclesia," by L. E. Delahogue, with which you are doubtless well acquainted, he saith [1], "The Church of Christ, as appears from many passages of the New Testament, is a Church TEACHING, *Teach all nations;* (Matth. xxviii.) JUDGING; *Tell the Church;* and ANATHEMATIZING: *Whoever shall not hear you, let him be to you as a heathen and a publican.*" (Matt. xvi.) Alas! brethren, for such a commentary. Did our Lord then pronounce curses upon the heathen and the publican? Or did he mean that his followers should promulgate the Gospel of peace, by cursing all that opposed them?

But the time for these ecclesiastical fulminations has passed, I trust for ever. I have no disposition to doubt, that if a similar council should assemble at the present day, the artillery of the curse would find no place

[1] Tract. de Ecclesia, p. 15. "Ecclesia Christi, ut patet ex multis Novi Testamenti locis, est ecclesia DOCENS, *Docete omnes gentes,* Matth. xxviii. JUDICANS, *Dic Ecclesiæ,* et ANATHEMATIZANS: *Qui non audierit, sit tibi sicut ethnicus et publicanus,* Matth. xvi."

amongst the weapons of their warfare. Nor am I willing to believe that you feel any sympathy with these denunciations.

True unhappily, it is, that your creed compels you, with all the power of assumed infallibility, to maintain this cruel form. True it is, that throughout the British dominions, you are bound to curse, *as a heretic*, the monarch whom you *obey as a king;* and are pledged, in the oath of 1791, to *support that very protestant succession*, upon which your faith forces you to invoke an unchangeable malediction. True it is, that even in the United States, the same melancholy necessity pursues you. Your rulers throughout the length and breadth of the land, are almost all heretics in your esteem: and while you pray for them, as rulers, you are obliged to curse them with the authority of a Church, which calls herself immutable; and which confidently asserts, that her sentence upon earth is ratified in heaven. All this, brethren, it must be confessed, is hard to tolerate, when it is fairly understood. And yet, I would fain hope, that the greater number of your body are right in practice, however wrong in theory. I take pleasure in the supposition, that just as liberal minded protestants, in general, close their eyes to this painful deformity in your creed, and forget its very existence; even so, a large majority amongst yourselves repeat the form assigned to you, without any definite conception of its meaning; that even when your tongues are uttering these damnatory phrases, a benevolent fraud is unconsciously perpetrated within you; that you pronounce a curse with your lips, while your hearts are ready to convert it into a blessing.

In the last place, however, I would ask, why do you cling to the phantom of infallibility, now that so much has been done among yourselves, to clear away the mists and darkness of the middle ages: and to open up the

path of primitive truth once more? Why endeavour to maintain, on the one hand, that the faith of the Church *was always the same*, while your own Cisalpine divines allow, on the other, that for many successive centuries, popes, bishops, councils, kings, nations, all except a few *of the most enlightened*, as Bossuet terms them, were involved in the same gross error with respect to the fundamental doctrine of papal supremacy? You say well, that our Saviour promised perpetuity to his Church, and that the gates of hell should not prevail against it. But he has nowhere said, that errors in doctrine should never be permitted to mingle with his truth. He has nowhere promised infallible guidance to a general council. The logic, specious and plausible as it is, by which you demonstrate the necessity of such an infallible directory, proves too much for your own admissions. For since you allow that the whole Church was so carried away for more than four hundred years, by the gross absurdities of doctrine and practice in reference to papal power; I ask you, where was her infallibility, and what was it worth, during all that time? Nor is this the most extraordinary part of the difficulty; for at this moment you have three different doctrines upon the same subject of papal power, and the infallibility of your Church does not enable you to agree upon any of them. Here, then, you present to us the marvellous spectacle of an infallible Church, not only adopting an erroneous doctrine of papal supremacy ever since the time of Gregory VII., but incapable of harmoniously interpreting her own system to this day! Surely, brethren, this simple statement of unquestionable facts, is enough to demonstrate the futility of the claim, and it must be high time to abandon it.

And yet there is a sense, in which the doctrine of infallibility is unquestionably true. I grant it, as I would grant the infallibility of St. Peter. The Saviour prayed

for him, that his *faith should not fail.* Therefore, that faith was certainly infallible. But although the apostle's faith was not allowed to FAIL, it was assuredly allowed TO FALL, so that he *denied his Master!* He repented—he was converted—and by the experience of that fall, he strengthened his brethren; and yet we find again, that he was blameable in the matter of the Jewish ceremonial law, and needed that St. Paul should "withstand him to the face." Even so, the faith of the Church might be allowed to fall into error, and yet it could not be said to fail, so long as it has grace to rise again. Nevertheless, as it would be poor policy to persuade a fallen man that he was still standing, because it is manifest that, if he believed you, he would not attempt to rise, so it must be a miserable mode of restoring your Church to her primitive truth, to assume, that because she was infallible, she never could have erred. With this argument to support them, the *Transalpine* divines are immoveable. That the pope, for centuries, claimed, *by divine right*, the exercise of supreme power, and successfully practised on the doctrine, is unquestionable. That the Church *believed the doctrine*, is equally certain. That it became engrafted on the *faith of the Church*, and was, to all intents and purposes, an article of her creed, cannot be denied without mere trifling; for surely that which is taught as a necessary inference from the word of God, as an essential in the constitution of the Church, as requisite to the good government of nations, as an undoubted prerogative of *divine right*, to be allowed by all men, from the king to the beggar—and which is *believed* as it is taught, and humbly submitted to, as it is believed, and all this for centuries together—surely it is nothing better than trifling to say, that this is not a part of *the faith.* And if the Church was all this time *infallible*, so that it was im-

possible for her to err in faith, then this divine right of temporal and absolute supremacy must still be your doctrine, and must continue to be so, to the end of the world.

Hence, as it seems to my mind, the enlightened and liberal men amongst you, brethren, only encumber themselves and impede their own laudable efforts, by attempting to make REFORM consist with INFALLIBILITY. In the sense which you attach to it, infallibility admits of no reform, because it is incapable of error. But in its just extent of meaning, infallibility is that blessed principle of spiritual life, by which the Redeemer preserves the great doctrines of his Gospel, even in the midst of surrounding errors, until the appointed time, when his kingdom shall be established in righteousness, and truth shall obtain a glorious and eternal victory.

CONCLUDING CHAPTER.

Brethren in Christ,

It was stated in the opening sentence of my third chapter, that the change of your primitive system, to which I had especially devoted this volume, was in the definition of the holy catholic Church; including, of course, your doctrine of the papacy, and of the councils. Lest it might be inferred from this, that I had no other ground of controversy with your claims, I beg leave to say that I have endeavoured to satisfy my mind in the same manner on all the other points involved in the principles of the reformation; and intend, if life and health continue, to present you with a similar examination of the fathers on these topics, at some future day. It only remains that I conclude my present work, by pointing, with all respect and kindness, to the path, in which, according to my humble judgment, duty and advantage would unite to attend you.

You are doubtless aware, that soon after the famous declaration of the French clergy, a plan to re-unite the reformed Churches with the Gallican Church of Rome was in agitation; that it proceeded with great privacy, and with fair prospects of success, and after an interval of some time, was again renewed, but was finally abandoned. That there was, indeed, reason to hope for a favourable conclusion of these efforts will be sufficiently credible, when it is recollected that such men as Bossuet, Du Pin,

and the cardinal de Noailles, upon the one side, and Molanus, Leibnitz, and archbishop Wake, upon the other, thought it not impossible.

It does not appear, however, that the minds of men were then favourably disposed to such a measure, in Great Britain. The maxims of intolerance were strongly established, national antipathies ran high, and the obstacles to the proper influence of enlightened counsels, were insurmountable.

Since that day, a great change has taken place in all the bearings of this mighty question. Revolutionary France cast out the Roman catholic religion: Napoleon restored it, but its credit and its influence have never regained their former level. The wealth and power of Rome are on the wane; and although the *Transalpine* doctrines have never been formally disavowed, and are, therefore, to this day, the doctrines of your Church, yet they cannot, by any possibility, be enforced, and are more and more regarded as a dead letter. On the other hand, the claims of the Roman catholics have risen in Great Britain to an unexpected height of estimation, and the weight of numbers and the skill of organized system, have been so successfully applied, as to threaten the established Church, and assail, in words at least, the upper house of parliament. Nor are the troubled waters yet at rest, but still heave and swell with portentous agitation.

In our own country[1], some wild and reckless spirits have attacked your principles and institutions, with great bitterness and animosity; but the reception they have experienced seems to have borne testimony to the friendly feelings of the community at large; and in the neighbouring province of Lower Canada, especially, a prompt and emphatic declaration of esteem on the part of those

[1] America.

who belonged to other Churches, has indicated a sensitiveness to your rights and a regard to your character, alike honourable to you and to themselves.

Observations might be added from the state of religious parties in Germany and Switzerland, from the increasing power of liberal sentiment in Spain, Portugal, and even Italy itself, which would further tend to show that there has been a wonderful diminution of the spirit of bigotry and intolerance on all sides; a relaxation of that high tension which previously kept every portion of Christendom in a belligerent attitude towards the rest, and a growing kindliness, which seems in some measure to have prepared the vast host of Christ for a return to the unity of the catholic Church, on the pure, simple, and equal principles of the primitive system.

Brethren, I am no prophet, neither the son of a prophet; and I may be deceived in discerning the signs of the times, by my sincere love of unity, by my strong dislike to dissensions of all kinds amongst the followers of the cross, and by my fervent desire to promote, by any lawful method in my power, the solid peace of the spiritual Israel. But whether I am deceived or not, I have thought that I saw an *approximation* towards unity, if it be nothing more; and I feel not a little disposed to the opinion, that a manifestation of primitive zeal amongst yourselves, with a judicious employment of encouraging effort on the part of those governments which have an established religion to maintain, would soon, under God, produce a settlement of all serious difficulty.

In perusing the writings of the fathers, no one can fail to be impressed with the solicitude which the Christian emperors displayed for the peaceful adjustment of every religious controversy. Thus the great majority of the early councils WERE ORDERED BY THE GOVERNMENT. The sovereigns took part in them with the liveliest ardour,

and employed all the influence of their rank and power to bring the Church to unity.

Was this not laudable? Surely it was. True, indeed, there was full often much intolerance, much persecution, much error, attendant upon the effort to maintain religious conformity. I praise not these. But apart from this alloy, I do not see why religious unity should not be as much the care of government as political unity. Conscience should never be forced in either case. But without forcing conscience, or putting any shackles on the reasonable exercise of human liberty, every government which is so constituted as to touch the subject of religion at all, may do much to discourage the spirit of dissension, and to cherish the cultivation of concord and peace.

The efforts necessary for such a purpose rest chiefly with yourselves; and permit me to say, brethren, that it concerns you, above all, to make them. For, disguise it as we may, it is not possible that your Church can be content with any thing short of her former dominion, *until the changes brought in upon her original polity are abandoned, and the primitive system is restored.* As your claims now stand, it is a mistake to suppose that you can be satisfied with equal rights and privileges. You may think so in a country like the United States, so long as nothing better is attainable. You may think so in a country like Great Britain, where you have been deprived of those equal rights for centuries. Galled by the yoke of protestant ascendancy, you may imagine, and be very sincere in proclaiming, that you desire nothing more than to stand upon the common level of your brethren. But remember, I beseech you, that your Church assumes to herself, BY DIVINE RIGHT, what no other Church assumes, the authority of *mother* and *mistress* over all the Churches. Remember that you exact an oath of *true obedience* to the bishop of Rome from every soul, at the

peril of his salvation. Remember that this oath is a part of the creed of pope Pius IV. out of which you hold that no one can be saved, and that in the same creed you sanction the anathemas of all the councils, especially the one hundred and twenty-four curses of the council of Trent, besides pronouncing a distinct curse on all heresies whatever. Your present system, therefore, OBLIGES you to be dissatisfied with any position which falls below these claims. You are BOUND, *in conscience*, to contend for power, until your Church is what you think she ought to be—the acknowledged mistress of the world. You are bound, in conscience, to be discontented until your rulers conform to your faith; for it is absurd to suppose that you are pleased with the duty of cursing, as heretics, those governors and magistrates whom you are pledged to honour and obey. And hence you stand in the perfectly peculiar position, of being compelled, by the very terms of your professed belief, to intrigue, to agitate, to proselyte, to strive, and to persevere, until you have regained every inch of your ancient territory. Within that mark, all that you recover must be used as an instrument for obtaining more. I do not see how you can consistently or honestly stop short of it; for while you maintain that the pope has been placed in the throne of universal supremacy by the voice of God; and while an oath of true obedience to him stands on the very face of the creed, by which you hope to enter the kingdom of heaven; the restoration of his rights and the maintenance of his dignity, as the vicar of Christ, must surely constitute, in your esteem, the paramount principle of earthly obligation.

Why not examine, then, over and over again, the grounds of a system, which is in such manifest conflict with the evidence of primitive antiquity, and with the duties which devolve on you, in all protestant countries, as citizens and men?

Why not recommence, under happier auspices, the attempt of Bossuet and Molanus in France, and a similar attempt in every other country where the importance of the subject can be appreciated? Why, especially in England,—instead of carrying on a system of aggression and intrigue for mere political rights and Church property, which only imbitters strife, and sharpens animosity,—why not select the wisest, the most learned, and the most moderate men, of all parties in religion, and engage every legitimate and honest influence of government to bring them to a kindly agreement?

Why not occupy the attention of the congress of sovereigns, which, of late years, has so often assembled to consider the political welfare of Europe, with the far more sublime and important topic of the unity of Christendom? Why not, on the free soil of the United States, propose to meet the various denominations, for the sake of friendly and affectionate discussion; instead of casting down the gauntlet of proud defiance, and challenging each other to the public war of words? Why not, in fine, brethren,—since the Church of Rome, by your own acknowledgment, has innovated so largely on the primitive system,—why not frankly cast aside the figments of *immutability* and *infallibility*, and with the Scriptures of truth and the lights of antiquity for your guides, retrace your course to the apostolic fountain? Why not abjure your anathemas, "bless and curse not," and bend all your energy and influence to the promotion of ancient catholic unity, in the spirit of charity and peace?

But perhaps the bare suggestion of such a practical result, may call down upon me the appellations of DREAMER—ENTHUSIAST—VISIONARY—FOOL! Be it so, brethren: I shall not quarrel with any man about the epithets of which he may think me worthy. A few years will place me beyond the reach of human judgment;

and meanwhile, with the storms and tempests, the distractions and calamities of the Church of God before me, let me dream—if you will call it so—of a brighter and a purer day. Let me indulge the enthusiasm which refuses to despair of the prosperity of Israel: let me behold in vision, if I cannot in reality, the harmony and concord of the Redeemer's fold; and when the dew of death is gathering on my forehead, let my last prayer be for the peace of Zion.

Yet, brethren,—be it enthusiasm, or not—it is my deep and solemn conviction, that no other course is so likely to avert a tremendous conflict, which may shake the Church to its centre, convulse the civilized world, and destroy every vestige of your influence and power. The elements of confusion are now at work: the superstition of ignorance, the bigotry of fanaticism, the scorn of infidelity, thinly disguised at best, and often triumphing under the broad banner of zeal for the public good, are all preparing to avail themselves of the hateful discord of the Church, and are ready to sacrifice, to the worst passions of the human heart, every pure and holy principle. In the fearful agitations which threaten Christendom, your dominion must be the first to fall; even as the loftiest trees are most sure to be uprooted in the fury of the storm. But the result is not to be predicted by human sagacity. The violent prostration of Christianity in any shape, injures it in all; and therefore every conservative maxim of wisdom combines with every motive of kindness, and every argument of duty, to recommend the timely magnanimity of a voluntary reform, in which all who profess the primitive faith, might equally unite, and be equally protected. The people of God, the rulers of nations, the friends of government and order, the lovers of virtue and of peace, should all look to it; for if the tempest of anarchy arises, the

generation yet unborn may weep over the apathy and the procrastination of those, who might have averted the calamity, but did not.

Brethren in Christ, my task is done. I acknowledge the manifold imperfections of its execution. I am aware that important questions, whether in Church or State, are apt to be very erroneously regarded by men, who, like myself, are far removed from courts and capitols, from the glare and turmoil of the great world, in the shade of a happy seclusion. With the operations of governments, with the science of politics, with the mighty and controlling spirits of the earth, it has pleased a gracious Providence to give me neither opportunity nor desire to intermeddle. But as one devoted to Christian unity and Christian concord, regarding you and every other portion of the universal Church with none but the kindliest feeling, and warmly attached to those principles which I believe to have distinguished the pure and primitive day, I have undertaken, in my obscurity, to approach the altar of truth, and lay upon it a sincere, although an humble offering. May the God of truth pardon its defects, and vouchsafe to it his acceptance and his blessing!

THE END.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.